

CITY of ANAHEIM:
Fairhome: Market-rate condominiums

<i>Project Name:</i>	Fairhome Condominiums
<i>Project Location:</i>	2638 W. Ball Road in West Anaheim
<i>Developer:</i>	Blume Family Trust PO Box 158, La Mirada California 92804 714 640 6488
<i>Owner:</i>	Same
<i>Project Components:</i>	-28 total units on 1.84 acres = 15.22 units per acre -14 duplex buildings to be constructed in 2 phases -plan A: 3 bdrm, 2.5 ba = 14 units @ 1635 sf ea -plan B: 3 bdrm, 2.5 ba = 14 units @ 1402 sf ea -all with 2 car garages, mini-backyards -all two stories -no driveways, garages up against access road -56 covered garage parking spaces with 28 uncovered visitor spaces
<i>Project Numbers:</i>	Tentative Tract 15204 Reclassification No. 94-95-12 Conditional Use Permit 3777
<i>Project Consultants:</i>	Architecture: Markitect

Project Description:

This housing subdivision is located in west Anaheim in an area that used to be primarily agricultural, but is now urbanized. To the north of the project site are single family residences across Ball Road; to the south are single family residences; to the east are multi-family residences and agricultural land; and to the west are multi-family apartments. Vehicular access to the site is from West Ball Road, where there is one main entrance. A 6' CMU sound wall is located at the perimeter of the project, except at West Ball Road.

The site plan is composed of a single cul-de-sac access road that runs along the center of the narrow site, with the duplexes to either side. An emergency service turn around is located at the south end of the site. A gated entry on West Ball Road is divided by a landscaped median that divides and directs incoming and outgoing vehicles. Decorative hardscape paving is located at this front entrance, which also receives the bulk of project landscaping. Visitor parking is located in perpendicular parking bays between every other duplex building. A sidewalk has been positioned alongside the eastern edge of duplexes only.

The buildings are designed in a non-descript Mediterranean style. The buildings are detailed only on the front facades; the other three elevations are relatively bare. The hip- and gable-roofed buildings are finished with stucco plaster for the walls, flat concrete tiles for the roof, and painted wood fascias. A combination of single hung and sliding metal windows are shown on the schematic design plans. Inoperable shutters and built-up foam / stucco trim are used to decorate the front elevations. Since the garages abut the access road, automatic roll-up garage doors are required for the project. These garages dominate the front elevations.

California Department of Housing and Community Development

Planning and Development Issues:

The project required a reclassification (rezone) from agricultural use to residential uses with 2400 sf lots.

The developer requested various waivers and variances from existing development standards (height, setbacks, building separation) to accommodate the long, thin shape of the parcel. The parcel shape is typical of agricultural use in the area, but not easily adaptable to residential uses.

The project site was generally flat and required little grading.

Demolition of a single family residence of 2761 sf was required to allow for new building construction.

Key Project Adjustments:

Few additions were made to the project as a result of agency comments; however several mitigation fees and assessments were required for project approval, including: \$8344 for transportation impacts; \$1204 for traffic signals; \$5366 for traffic impacts; unknown school fees, etc.

No noticeable changes to the project design were noted in the project files.

Approval Chronology: (important approval dates in bold)

15 Sept 77	Land acquired;
24 Mar 95	Title Report by Continental Lawyers Title Co.
11 Apr 95	Initial Study of Environmental Impact;
12 Apr 95	Architect's drawings dated;
10 May 95	Notification of proposed residential development; to be discussed at Planning Commission meeting of 10 July 95;
10 May 95	Magnolia School District comments—school district already impacted; wants mitigation fees of \$7080 per new student;
10 May 95	Anaheim Union School District comments—new students can be accommodated;
15 May 95	Property Owners Certification;
17 May 95	Supplement to Petition for Conditional Use Permit Application submitted;
17 May 95	Petitioner's Statement – re: justification for variance or waiver due to irregular shape of the parcel; request for variance with regard to building separation to 10' rather than 16'; request to increase building heights to two stories rather than the permitted one story within 150' of a residential zone; request to adjust setbacks to 12' and 10' rather than the allowed 20';
2 June 95	Notarized application for Conditional Use Permit submitted;
2 June 95	Full Negative Declaration (unmitigated) declared by Planning Department with 20 findings; findings respond briefly to format of initial study check list;
2 June 95	Project routed to agencies for comment;
29 June 95	Inter-departmental coordination meeting to discuss project;
29 June 95	Fees paid; \$3249.84 total;
29 June 95	Declaration of mailing to residents;
10 July 95	Staff Report to Planning Commission; request for CEQA Negative Declaration certification—and other permit approvals; project does not require growth mgmt impact analysis; only 16 conditions of approval included within the staff report as per agency comments; conditions are minor and standard;

California Department of Housing and Community Development

10 July 95 **Planning Commission meeting: project approved by Resolution. No. PC95-81;** all permits approved and Negative Declaration certified; passed unanimously; 2 people spoke in opposition to the project—they wanted deeper setbacks and a higher soundwall around the project; minimum findings included in the final Resolution documents;

18 July 95 **City Council meeting: project approved; no action taken to change or modify Planning Commission recommendations;**

21 July 95 Planning Department letter to Applicant - re: notification of Planning Commission and City Council actions;

3 Aug 95 Notice of Determination filed with county;

21 Aug 95 **Building Permit application submitted;**

10 Sept 95 CC&Rs executed by owner and Title Co; possible school mitigation fees for overcrowding included in the language and passed on to buyers;

15 Sept 95 Architect's drawings revised;

3 Nov 95 Demolition Permit issued;

29 Nov 95 **Building Permit issued;**

5 Dec 95 City Council approves Final Tract Map

Total Time for Approvals:

Project Approval by City:	2 June 1995 - 18 July 1995 = 1.25 months
Building Permit Approval:	21 Aug 1995 - 29 Nov 1995 = 3.25 months

Public Participation / Opposition:

The project received little opposition from neighbors and other groups. Just a couple of residents opposed the project at the Planning Commission meeting. No written opposition was received. A West End neighborhood group requested typical changes on the project, but these were disregarded by the approval bodies. Neighborhood groups in Anaheim have voluntary review over projects—frequently comment—but typically have little impact. Every area of the city is represented by some type of neighborhood group or coalition. The city is divided into 23 community planning areas, and these are monitored by the Community Planning Division, a component of the Planning Department.

CITY of BAKERSFIELD:
Brookfield Loop: market-rate condominiums

<i>Project Name:</i>	Brookfield Loop 4-plexes
<i>Project Location:</i>	northwest quadrant of Gosford Road and So. Laurelglenn Blvd. in southwest Bakersfield south of Californial State Univ. Bakersfield
<i>Developer:</i>	Amhurst Homes
<i>Owner:</i>	Amhurst Homes Jack and Norma Turman 4301 Park Circle Drive, Bakersfield California 93309 805 322 9626
<i>Project Components:</i>	-92 units on 23 condominium lots on 7.02 acres = 13.11 du/ac; -condominium lots range from 9795 sf to 16300 sf -typical lot dimensions are 54' x 190' -all buildings are four-plexes of identical design across the site -each unit has 2 bdrms and 1.5 ba with 1 Car garage @ 1100 sf -no community amenities or recreation centers on site
<i>Project Numbers:</i>	APN: 389-171-04 Tract Map: 5810
<i>Project Consultants:</i>	Civil Engineering: Hull & Associates Contractor: Greg Hornbuckle 805 327 7041

Project Description:

This housing subdivision is located in southwest Bakersfield approximately 4 miles from the city center. The project site is located in the northwest quadrant of the intersection of Gosford Road and South Laurelglenn Boulevard in the California State University Bakersfield area. This section of town is currently being transformed from agricultural and oil well uses and there are many vacant properties still waiting to be developed. To the west of the project site is vacant land across Brookside Drive; to the east is an All Saints Church complex across Gosford Road; to the north are 2 story single family residences; to the south across South Laurelglenn Boulevard is a single family tract and vacant land. The topography of the site is flat. The land was vacant prior to this development.

The project site is roughly rectangular in shape, but splayed out to the west following the curve of Brookside Drive as it curves from the northwest to the south. A lushly landscaped 30' setback and sound walls are located along Gosford Road and South Laurelglenn Boulevard.

A single private roadway enters the site from Brookside Drive in the northwest corner, traveling east, turning south, and bisecting the site down the center before exiting at South Laurelglenn Boulevard. To the west of this access road are 11 condominium lots, and to the east are 12 others. The lots are deep and narrow, and lie perpendicular to this access road. All of the front yards are directed towards the west however. The lots to the west of Brookfield Loop are accessed directly from Brookside Drive. The lots to the east are accessed by Brookfield Loop at the center of the property.

California Department of Housing and Community Development

Shared driveway courts for every two lots run perpendicular to Brookfield Loop and Brookside Drive. The four-plexes are long narrow buildings with the units side-by-side. The units face each other along the shared driveway courts. Each unit has a single Car garage, which provides some measure of sound insulation between the units. The units also have small fenced backyards and a small front patio area at the front door.

The buildings are all identical in color, shape, and design. They are designed in a spare, contemporary suburban style. They are finished in off-white stucco plaster, muted red concrete roof tiles, white metal sliding windows, and dark red metal doors and garage doors. The units have fireplaces and chimneys. The buildings are austere. The front yards are well landscaped and the project is extremely well maintained.

Planning and Development Issues:

The initial applicant sold the project to a different home builder after the entitlements were granted.

The entitlements process for this project was extremely short and uncomplicated. No rezone was required for the project. The only approval required was a tract map.

Environmental analysis for the project was covered by an Initial Study completed by the Planning Department. A Mitigated Negative Declaration was recommended, with few potential impacts noted, save for impacts to biological resources, traffic and public services.

Planning Department staff suggested to the developer that the street bisecting the project site be privatized rather than dedicated to the city, which the developer agreed. The owner wanted to dedicated the landscape setbacks to the city, but the city refused, citing that it does not accept landscape dedications for multi-family projects. These landscape setbacks were originally owned by Castle and Cooke (a large Bakersfield development company). The Public Works Department suggested that the owner purchase these for inclusion in the maintenance responsibilities of the Home Owners Association or property owner.

Key Project Adjustments:

Although the Planning Department distributed the project widely for agency comment, the service providers and agencies were extremely cursory in their comments and provided few project additions. The conditions of approval were very short with few requirements, most of which were standard, including: an additional traffic study—which found no potential impacts to the surrounding community, a sound wall and a landscape setback from the adjacent arterials. Pertinent conditions of approval are described below under the Planning Department Staff Report.

The Applicant's engineer requested deviation from city standards with regard to lot widths across the project site. The Planning Commission granted this request. The applicant also requested a waiver of mineral rights dedications to the city; no outcome on this issue was noted in the project files. The applicant requested a waiver of parkland dedication, which was approved, because parkland obligations in the project area had already been met. However, park development fees were required by the Building Department and paid for the project.

Through the entitlements process, no change in the lot or unit count was noted. The proposal and the entitlements granted for this project indicated the construction of tri-plexes on all condominium lots for a total of 69 units. However, since the City of Bakersfield does not require a submittal or review of architectural elements--and because the land use designation and development standards allowed increased densities, the developer changed the tri-plexes to four-plexes with no dispute from the city; thereby increasing the unit count by 23 to 92 total units.

California Department of Housing and Community Development

Approval Chronology: (important approval dates in bold)

6 Feb 95	Title Report by World Title Co;
10 Feb 95	application for tract map submitted;
10 Feb 95	applicant signs City's Indemnification Agreement;
16 Feb 95	Planning Department fees of \$2280 paid for tract map application;
15 Feb 95	Engineer's drawings dated;
15 Feb 95	Environmental Information Form submitted by applicant; only potential impact noted is an increase in the need for public services;
16 Feb 95	Hazardous Waste Verification Statement: project site not on city's list of hazardous. waste sites;
16 Feb 95	applicant signs Agreement to Mitigation Measures;
17 Feb 95	Department of Water Services comments: will-serve letter for provision of water to project;
17 Feb 95	Engineer letter to Planning Commission – re: request for lot width reduction;
17 Feb 95	Engineer letter to Planning Commission – re: request to waive signature of mineral rights to city;
21 Feb 95	Subdivision check list by Planning Department;
22 Feb 95	Planning Department letter to Engineer – re: notification of incomplete application; site plan adjustments and traffic study required;
28 Feb 95	Engineer letter to Planning Commission -- re: request for lot width reduction;
1 Mar 95	Engineer letter to Planning Department – re: submission and responses to incomplete application items;
3 Mar 95	Project routed to agencies for comment; due back 27 Mar 95;
7 Mar 95	De Minimus Impact Fee paid to California Department of Fish and Game: \$40;
7 Mar 95	Initial Study for Environmental Assessment completed by Planning Department; no significant impacts noted; potential impacts to biological resources, traffic; all impacts and issues discussed at length; Mitigated Negative Declaration recommended; 787 Mar 95 Building Department comments: soils report required;
8 Mar 95	Hazardous Materials comments: none;
8 Mar 95	Panama / Buena Vista School District comments: none;
8 Mar 95	Water Resources Division comments: none;
9 Mar 95	Traffic Study prepared by Ronald F. Ruettgers; 475 average daily trips; minimal impacts to area indicated;
10 Mar 95	Bakersfield Police comments: none;
13 Mar 95	Kern County Sheriffs Department comments: none;
14 Mar 95	Engineer letter to Planning Department – re: possible street names suggested;
15 Mar 95	Kern County Planning Department comments: none;
17 Mar 95	Planning Department selects name for street: Brookfield Loop;
21 Mar 95	Pacific Bell comments: none;
22 Mar 95	PG&E Land Agent comments: 6' easement required at front of lots;
22 Mar 95	Department of Conservation comments: no known oil, gas or injection wells at site;
24 Mar 95	Notice of Public Hearing for Planning Commission meeting of 17 Apr 95 and 20 Apr 95;
31 Mar 95	Engineer letter to Planning Commission – re: request for park land waiver due to previous set asides and fees for this site by Tenneco;
3 Apr 95	Staff Report to Planning Commission: extensive site specific findings included; 14 conditions of approval recommended to Commission: city requires sidewalk around project and traffic deceleration lane at Gosford Road and South Laurelglan Boulevard, private streets to be maintained by Home Owners Association, annexation to the Maintenance District, Home Owners Association to be formed, owner responsible for street, landscape, walls and fences, sound walls required to east and south of the project, 30' landscape setback required at Gosford and Laurelglan;
3 Apr 95	Planning Department comments: easements required for utilities; Habitat Conservation fees of
5 Apr 95	US Postal Service comments: none;

Multi-family Projects

California Department of Housing and Community Development

6 Apr 95	Public Works Department comments: extensive standard comments;
11 Apr 95	Planning Department letter to applicant – re: Notice to applicant for Agreement to Conditions of Approval and request to Planning Commission to be placed on consent agenda;
17 Apr 95	Planning Commission meeting: project discussed and continued to next meeting;
20 Apr 95	Planning Commission meeting: project approved; only 15 conditions of approval; 15 th condition added by Commission to include Park Maintenance District fees; no public opposition to the project; just one resolution required and passed unanimously; reduced lot width granted;
24 Apr 95	Notice of Determination filed; Mitigated Negative Declaration;
2 May 95	Planning Department letter to applicant – re: notification of Planning Commission approval;
9 Nov 95	Department of Conservation comments: no further comments;

Total Time for Approvals:

Project Approval by City:	10 Feb 1995 - 20 Apr 1995 = 2 months
Building Permit Approvals (pre-mastered):	22 Sept 1995 - 25 Sept 1995 = 3 days
Building Construction Period (house):	25 Sept 1995 - 12 Nov 1995 = 1.75 months

Public Participation / Opposition:

No public opposition to the project was voiced at the public hearing nor in any other manner.

CITY OF CARLSBAD:
Villas at El Camino: affordable apartments

<i>Project Name:</i>	Villas at El Camino / La Terraza / Villa Loma
<i>Project Location:</i>	On the El Camino Real between Camino Vida Roble & Alga Rd.
<i>Developer:</i>	<p>Alvira Land Associates LP 2011 Palomar Airport Road Suite 106, Carlsbad California 92009 760 931 1190</p> <p>Patrick Development / La Terraza Associates 2445 Fifth Ave. Suite 400, San Diego California 92101 619 231 3637</p> <p>Bridge Housing Corporation One Hawthorne 4th Floor, San Francisco California 92105 415 989 1111</p>
<i>Owner:</i>	<p>Mary E. Bressi Trust, and</p> <p>Bank of America National Savings and Trust Association 234 E. Colorado Blvd. Suite 500, Pasadena California 91121 818 304 3569</p>
<i>Project Components:</i>	<p>-344 units on 23.5 acres = 14.6 units / acre -tot lot, recreation center, pool, spa, and leasing office -5 building types with various numbers of units per configuration -4 standardized unit types -2 and 3 stories typical -original application had 1-3 bdrm units ranging from 634 sf - 1052 sf -Final built project had a mix of 1-4 Bdrm units.</p>
<i>Project Numbers:</i>	<p>APNs: 215-020-15 and a portion of 215-020-01 Site Development Plan 93-01 Hillside Development Permit 93-08 Special Use Permit 93-02 Zone Change 93-02</p>
<i>Project Consultants:</i>	<p>Civil Engineering: bha, inc. Architecture: The McKinley Associates, Inc. Architecture: Rodriguez Design Associates, Inc. Landscape Architecture: Gillespie Design Group Inc.</p>

Project Description:

This walk-up garden apartment project is located in an undeveloped area of south-central Carlsbad in the Poinsettia Hills. The project is sited in an area of disturbed grasslands, chamise, baccharis and southern mixed chaparrals. An industrial site is located to the north of the site. Greenhouses are located to the south. El Camino Real is to the east; native vegetation areas are located west of the site. The project is accessed by a new road along the southern boundary from El Camino Real to the east. Emergency gated access points are located to both the northeast on El Camino Real and the northwest to the vacant land area.

Multi-family Projects

California Department of Housing and Community Development

The site plan consists of a central curving road from the center-south entrance extending to the northwest corner where the retention basin is located. From this central spine, branching residential cul-de-sacs are positioned to either side. Parking is located throughout the site and along both the eastern perimeter at El Camino Real and the southern access road. The buildings are sited end to end with parking areas parallel to the lines of buildings along the cul-de-sacs. To one side of the cul-de-sac are covered carports, and to the other side are uncovered parking spaces and the residential buildings. The slope to each graded pad falls away behind each building to the next carport and cul-de-sac. The tot lot, recreation center, leasing office, pool and spa are sited near the entrance to the project. The buildings are designed in a contemporary Mediterranean style with hip roofs, concrete Spanish roof tiles, and stucco plaster walls and window sills. The buildings have a mix of aluminum sash and sliding windows and are detailed with metal handrails and balconies. An extensive Landscape plan has been provided for the site.

The project site was eventually optioned to the City of Carlsbad, and HUD CDBG funds were used for the construction of the project. Bridge Housing Corporation was brought on midway through the development process as a limited partner in the project. 70% of the units are intended as very-low income units based on 50% of median income; 30% of the units are intended as low-income units based on 60% of median income. Some manipulation of the unit types and numbers occurred during the building permit approvals and construction process.

Planning and Development Issues:

The project required Planning Commission, City Council and California Coastal Commission approvals. The project required a rezone from limited control LC Zone (an interim zone for future uses) to multi-family residential RD-M. These were processed concurrently. Several sightings of the endangered gnatcatcher were reported during the course of project analysis, which required Department of the Interior and California Department of Fish and Game consultations.

Extensive grading was required to prepare several graded pads for construction of the buildings. 122,000 cubic yards (cy) of cut; 190,000 cy of fill; and 68,000 cy of imported soils were required to grade the pads for construction. 16% of the site was comprised of slopes greater than 15%. A large drainage retention basis was required at the northwest corner of the site. The project fulfills the inclusionary housing component of the Aviara Master Plan.

The Carlsbad Unified School District challenged the city with a lawsuit over the approval of the project with regard to potential school impact fees associated with the project. A settlement agreement was executed between the city and the school district for mitigation fees. Litigation however did not stall the approvals process by any considerable period of time, as the project was already approved by both the Planning Commission and City Council when the lawsuit was filed.

Opposition from the greenhouse operator Sun-Fresh Roses to the south of the project required negotiation and intervention by the mayor's office with regard to the southern access road to the project and the location of a driveway to the greenhouse operation. The city and developer shared the costs of the access adjustments to Sun-Fresh Roses property.

Key Project Adjustments:

The project required an inordinate number of studies and analyses. Comments and conditions from several agencies added several requirements to the project: a traffic signal, sound walls at three edges of the project, a bus turnout, public road improvements, median strip improvements, additional soils testing, site redesign for building placement, planting specifications, and others. Project unit count fluctuated throughout project approvals. An earlier application proposed 381 units; this proposal submitted 344 units; and a density increase request to 372 units was rejected somewhere mid-project. Detailing of balconies and fencing was reduced by staff through requests by the developer.

Multi-family Projects

California Department of Housing and Community Development

Approval Chronology: (important approval dates in bold)

2 June 88	Land acquired by Mary E. Bressi and Security Pacific National Bank;
26 Jan 90	Land acquired by Carlsbad I and Spiers Enterprises
April 92	Biological Study for the Poinsettia Hills Development Project by Anita M. Hayworth;
July 92	Preliminary Soils and Geologic Report for Little/Bressi/Spires Property by Geocon Inc;
20 July 92	Biological Technical Report for Little / Bressi Project by Peter Famolaro / RECON;
20 July 92	Cultural resource reconnaissance by Sue A. Wade, Archaeologist—no site discovered;
3 Aug 92	Limited Environmental Assessment by GeoSoils Inc;
12 Aug 92	Previous project submittal and project information booklet for 381 unit project by Hillman Properties, Inc; (submittal as new applications -w/ fees from previous applied to the project)
18 Aug 92	Routing slip to agencies by Planning Department;
21 Aug 92	Engineering Department. comments and conditions;
21 Aug 92	Planning Department Memo – re: density transfer from other parcels allows 243 unit project only with regard to Excess Dwelling Unit Bank;
3 Sept 92	Preliminary Review and Initial EIA for the previous project;
29 Jan 93	applicant letter to city – re: transfer of entitlements from previous developers Don Woodward and Pacific Landmark Development Co.
11 Feb 93	Title Report by Commonwealth Land Title Co. and proof to title insurance;
8 Mar 93	Title Report by First America Title Insurance Co. for Mary E. Bressi;
24 May 93	Agreement signed by city and developer for the payment of a Public Facilities Fee; developer to pay 3.5% of building valuation;
24 May 93	Project planning meeting with Planning Department at Aviara offices;
26 May 93	Planning Department memo to Building and Safety – re: estimate needed for development fees;
14 June 93	Engineering Department letter to project engineer – re: summary of agreements over last few mtgs;
24 June 93	Environmental Impact Assessment Form filled out by applicant—only 2 impacts noted: loss of summer holly habitat areas and construction on slopes;
29 June 93	applicant memo to Planning Department – re: project processing schedule with time estimates;
30 June 93	Planning application submitted with fee of \$7830;
8 July 93	Project planning meeting with developer and Planning Department;
9 July 93	Western CNC letter to Planning Department – re: notification of 24 hour operation and noise at industrial site north of project;
12 July 93	Routing to Engineering Department for additional comments;
13 July 93	De Minimus Impact Finding / Certificate of Fee Exemption California Department. of Fish and Game;
15 July 93	Anthony and Dicky K. Bons letter to Planning Department: greenhouse neighbors at Sun-Fresh Roses to the south of the project are concerned over subdivision of land and potential development impacts to their property; especially with regard to the south access road and the driveway to their property;
19 July 93	Project planning meeting with Planning Department and developer;
19 July 93	Engineering Department memo to Planning Department – re: incomplete application w/ items to be addressed;
19 July 93	Engineering Department memo to Planning Department – re: additional conditions for EIA mitigations, including the requirement of the traffic signal and increased street standards;
19 July 93	Planning Department letter to applicant – re: notice of incomplete application w/ list of issues;
20 July 93	Planning Department EIA checklist—no Significant impacts noted; monitoring and mitigations recommended include: agency matrix of responsibilities, traffic signal at new intersection of El Camino Real and the south access road, additional soils testing and analysis report required, NPDES Permit for construction runoff;
22 July 93	Landscape drawings revised;

Multi-family Projects

California Department of Housing and Community Development

22 July 93 Notice of Conditional Negative Declaration for 372 units;
 26 July 93 Planning Department letter to applicant – re: resubmittal of exhibits for Planning Commission mtg for 1 Sept 93;
 26 July 93 applicant letter to Planning Department – re: request for incentives for project; and noise study;
 26 July 93 Disclosure Statement submitted;
 27 July 93 Project planning meeting with developer and Planning Department;
 27 July 93 Routing to all agencies by Planning Department – comments due back by 3 Aug 93;
 27 July 93 Noise Analysis by Mestre Greve Associates, report no. 93-83-A;
 27 July 93 Building and Safety comments: minor development standards issues;
 30 July 93 Utilities and Maintenance Department comments: additional street lighting required on El Camino;
 2 Aug 93 Housing and Redevelopment Department memo to Planning Department – re: city’s intent to purchase property site with CDBG funds;
 2 Aug 93 Project planning meeting with developer and Planning Department;
 2 Aug 93 Agreement between developer and city for the payment of public facilities fees with regard to valuation and subdividing the property into a 20.3 acre parcel and 3.2 acre parcel;
 3 Aug 93 Landscape plan check comments – plans redlined;
 3 Aug 93 Municipal Water District comments and conditions – standard;
 5 Aug 93 Fire Department & Prevention comments -- standard comments + additional separation between buildings; use of native vegetation plantings; changes in site development standards;
 6 Aug 93 Engineering Department letter to Mr. Bons – re: responses to concerns in his letter;
 7 Aug 93 Biological Technical Report by Anita M. Hayworth;
 9 Aug 93 Planning Department letter to Mr. Bons – re: responses to concerns in his letter;
 10 Aug 93 Engineering Department letter to applicant – re: proposed minor subdivision 93-07 conditions;
 12 Aug 93 Landscape drawings revised;
13 Aug 93 Revised site development plans submitted;
 18 Aug 93 North County Transit District comments – offsite bus stop required;
 19 Aug 93 Notice of Public Hearing for Planning Commission mtg of 1 Sept 93 for 344 units;
 19 Aug 93 Review of Minor Subdivision 93-07 by Planning Department;
 undated Planning Department memo-to-file – re: phone conversation with Mr. Bons, who now completely opposes the project;
 20 Aug 93 Notice of Completion for environmental requirements by State Clearinghouse;
 20 Aug 93 California Department of Fish & Game letter to Planning Department – re: gnatcatcher sighting at project site;
 23 Aug 93 Engineering Department. comments and conditions revised: all streets must be dedicated to city; required full half street improvements along El Camino Real at project boundary; required full median improvements at the project frontage; required adjacent street improvements on southern access road;
 23 Aug 93 Departmental Coordinating Committee meeting;
23 Aug 93 Planning Department letter to applicant – re: notification of complete application;
 23 Aug 93 City Attorney comments: changes and rewordings of staff report required for legal purposes;
24 Aug 93 Revised site development plans submitted;
 24 Aug 93 Engineer’s letter to Applicant re: changes to conditions for minor subdivision 93-07;
 25 Aug 93 Meeting at Mayor’s office with Mr. Bons & Planning Department -- re: relocation of driveway for Sun-Fresh Roses and complaints with the Engineering Department;
 31 Aug 93 Colored exhibits submitted to Planning Department;
 1 Sept 93 Planning Department Staff Report Bridge Housing Corporation listed along with Aviara; report discusses a 196% density bonus request from the developer to bring the project to 344 units;
1 Sept 93 Project Approved by Planning Commission at public hearing: 4 residents spoke in opposition the project. Several resolutions adopted and approved to allow the various permits required for the project. Planning Commission required upgraded carports for the project; 89 conditions of approval adopted for project from agency comments;

California Department of Housing and Community Development

8 Sept 93 Engineering Department letter to Planning Department re: changes to conditions requiring developer to pay proportionate share of construction of Poinsettia Lane;

14 Sept 93 Planning Department letter to applicant re: notification of Planning Commission decision of approval;

14 Oct 93 Staff Report by the Carlsbad Redevelopment Department;

22 Oct 93 applicant letter to California Coastal Commission – re: parcel subdivision not to affect development proposal; west parcel not within Coastal Commission jurisdiction;

26 Oct 93 Carlsbad Unified School District (CUSD) Attorney letter to City Council requesting full EIR for project since EIA didn't address school impacts adequately -or- Mello Roos designation;

26 Oct 93 City Council Meeting: discussion of zone change and financial assistance to project, continued to next meeting;

28 Oct 93 Notice of CEQA Determination of Mitigated Negative Declaration;

2 Nov 93 City Council approves project through several resolutions and ordinances; Conditional Negative Declaration certified and all other permits approved;

2 Nov 93 US Department of Interior letter to Planning Department re: additional gnatcatcher sighting at project site; project determination does not require federal permitting due to lack of habitat in area despite sightings;

3 Nov 93 Housing and Redevelopment Department memo to Planning Department re: inadequacy of EIA for HUD purposes with regard to noise and air quality requirements;

4 Nov 93 California Coastal Commission Permit application submitted;

15 Nov 93 City Council exercises option to purchase project land from Aviara Land Associates;

16 Nov 93 Second memo from Housing and Redevelopment Department. to Planning – re: HUD EIA requirements;

30 Nov 93 City Attorney letter to the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD)– re: request for HCD intervention in litigation / legal precedent on school impact mitigations for housing projects;

7 Dec 93 Planning Department analysis of Air Quality / Noise Impacts to meet HUD requirements;

13 Dec 93 HCD letter to City Council – re: letter of support without intervention in legal case;

14 Dec 93 California Department of Fish and Game letter to Planning Department – re: comments on gnatcatcher habitat;

16 Dec 93 California Coastal Commission hearing and project approval;

22 Dec 93 HCD letter to City Attorney – re: HCD refrains from participation in litigation;

25 Dec 93 HUD releases \$880,000 of CDBG funds for project;

28 Dec 93 City Attorney letter to HCD – re: response to previous letter about litigation;

29 Dec 93 Administrative Record Summary of Project forwarded to City Clerk from Planning Department;

3 Jan 94 Notice of Intent to Issue Permit by California Coastal Commission;

13 Jan 94 CEQA Settlement Conference posting;

19 Jan 94 Settlement meeting between City Attorney and CUSD;

20 Jan 94 CUSD Attorney letter to City Attorney re: request for expanded Administrative Record Summary of Project; previous incomplete and unacceptable;

27 Jan 94 City Attorney memo to Planning Department re: time extension for preparation of Administrative Record for CUSD attorneys to 14 Feb 94;

27 Jan 94 HUD releases \$1.2 million of CDBG funds for project;

1 Feb 94 CUSD Attorney letter to Planning Department re: items to be included on Administrative Record;

3 Feb 94 CUSD letter to City Attorney re: forwarding of school location plan (adopted 25 Jan 89);

9 Feb 94 City Attorney letter to CUSD Attorney re: submittal of additional documents;

9 Feb 94 City Attorney letter to CUSD Attorney re: school location plans; previous growth expectations; and current plans for three schools in area;

8 Mar 94 US Department of Interior / Fish and Wildlife Service letter to Planning Department re: biological studies not performed in accordance with federal guidelines; due to two additional gnatcatcher sightings, DOI now concludes that the site supports habitat for the species;

California Department of Housing and Community Development

22 Mar 94	City Council Agenda Bill and resolution for reimbursement agreement with redevelopment agency for acquisition of land and affordable housing project, and resolution for financial restructuring of project;
6 Apr 94	North County Transit District comments – now wants bus turnout on El Camino Real at the project site;
11 Apr 94	Engineer's submittals – substantial conformity exhibit;
18 Apr 94	Housing and Redevelopment Department letter to San Diego Gas and Electric Co. re: request for relocation of facilities into their designated easement;
22 Apr 94	Engineer's submittals – site plan revision;
22 Apr 94	North County Transit District letter to Engineer re: bus turnout placement on El Camino;
25 Apr 94	Engineer's submittals – substantial conformity exhibit-the report indicated much lower impact fees than suggested by district.
27 Apr 94	Engineer's submittals – site plan revision;
1 June 94	School Impact Report of Low and Moderate Income Housing by Recht Hausrath & Associates: 227 - 312 projected additional students as a result of project; cost impact of \$2.75 - \$3.78 million, which falls far short of potential impact fees suggested by district.
13 June 94	City Attorney letter to CUSD Attorney re: submittal of school impact report and discussion of settlement @ \$2.65 / sf + approx. \$338,000; disparity with CUSD suggested mitigation fees and amounts;
23 June 94	Master Building Permit application for site improvements and buildings;
28 June 94	Biologist Hayworth letter to applicant – re: no gnatcatcher's or nesting areas sighted;
19 July 94	Engineer's submittal – geotechnical report;
20 July 94	City Attorney letter to CUSD Attorney re: forward of executed settlement and release agreement;
21 July 94	Patrick Property Services letter to Bridge – re: conditions of CCC permit with regard to the gnatcatcher requiring consultation with the US Fish & Wildlife Service;
29 July 94	Soils Testing Report by Petra Geo-Tech South, Inc. – re: pesticides testing find traces of DDT / DDE in non-harmful percentages;
2 Aug 94	First indication of project developer and name change to La Terraza or Villa Loma;
29 Nov 94	Master Building Permit issued for site improvements and buildings;
29 Nov 94	Bulk of Individual Building Permit Applications – clone permits;
28 Dec 94	First phase of clone Building Permits issued;
16 Dec 93	California Coastal Commission hearing and project approval;
5 Apr 95	Second phase of clone Building Permits issued;
13 June 95	Final color scheme submitted by Patrick Property Services;
13 June 95	La Terraza letter to Planning Department re: exterior noise mitigations, requesting elimination of glass balcony noise barriers;
20 June 95	Planning Department letter to La Terraza re: approving change of balcony materials;
27 June 95	City Council resolution for condemnation of road easements for Cassia Road and El Camino Real;
16 June 96	Bridge letter to Planning Department re: request for fence change to partial wood and chain link;
10 July 96	Bridge letter to Planning Department re: second fence request letter;
15 July 96	Bridge letter to Planning Department re: change of fence material at west boundary to black vinyl coated chain link;
19 Oct 96	Master Building Permit Finaled;
13 Jan 97	Release of Restriction on Real Property re: lot subdivision for project;

Total Time for Approvals:

Project Approval by City:	30 June 1993 - 2 Nov 1993 = 5.5 months
Project Approval by California Coastal Comm.	4 Nov 1993 - 16 Dec 1994 = 13 . 5 months
Master Building Permit Approval:	23 June 1994 - 29 Nov 1994 = 5.25 months
Building Permit Clone Approval:	29 Nov 1994 - 28 Dec 94 = 1 month
Building Construction period:	28 Dec 94 - 19 Oct 96 = 21.5 months

Multi-family Projects

Public Participation / Opposition:

There was minor opposition from a few neighbors who spoke against the project at the Planning Commission meeting. No community groups opposed the project. Opposition from the Carlsbad Unified School District was not directly targeted at the project, but at the approval process by the city and the lack of recognition for school impacts and mitigations.

CITY of CHULA VISTA:
Cordova Village: affordable apartments

<i>Project Name:</i>	Cordova Village
<i>Project Location:</i>	1280 East J Street, Chula Vista Between Paseo Ranchero and Vaquero Court
<i>Developer:</i>	South Bay Community Services (a non-profit organization) 315 Fourth Ave. Ste E, Chula Vista California 91910 619 420 3620
<i>Owner:</i>	Rancho Del Rey / McMillan Companies 2727 Hoover Ave, National City California 91950 619 477 4170 x212
<i>Project Components:</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">-single phase development-40 units on 2.968 acres = 13.5 units / acre<ul style="list-style-type: none">-unit type 1 = 2 br / 1 ba @ 745 sf w/ 16 units-unit type 2 = 3 br / 2 ba @ 1140 sf w/ 16 units-unit type 3 = 4 br / 2 ba @ 1260 sf w/ 8 units-3 building configurations:<ul style="list-style-type: none">-bldg type A = four 3 br units-bldg type B = four 4 br units-bldg type C = eight 2 br units-each 3 br unit has a patio covered by an open wood trellis-each 4 br unit has a patio covered by building above-1320 sf commons bldg w/ laundry, common room, office, fireplace-86 uncovered parking spaces (2 / unit + visitor parking)-all residential buildings are two stories
<i>Project Numbers:</i>	APN: 640-090-22 Development Review Committee: DRC 97-20 Tracking No: T 97-068 BL: 156, DQ: 348
<i>Project Consultants:</i>	Civil Engineering: Cinti Land Planning Architecture: Studio E Architects Market Analysis: REEB Development Consulting

Project Description:

This small affordable project is located at the tip of a larger parcel (R-6) in the Rancho Del Rey master planned community in Special Planning Area III of the General Development Plan. The project is located on land that was vacant but had been previously graded. A twenty foot grade change exists between this parcel and the larger parcel to the south from which this site was subdivided. Although this is designated as an affordable housing project, it does not fulfill the affordable housing set-aside for any other phase of the Rancho Del Rey development. The project site is a five-sided parcel of land at the end of East J Street which is to the northwest of the site. To the south is a large townhouse development within Rancho Del Rey; to the North and East are other housing parcels.

California Department of Housing and Community Development

A 5' high masonry sound wall surrounds the project site. The main vehicular and pedestrian access points are located on East J Street. An access driveway along the northern boundary of the property leads to a community parking area along the east and south sides of the project site directly adjacent to a large sloped Landscape area (125' setback) that rises to properties along Buena Vista Way. The residential buildings are set in a landscaped lawn area and are configured in a triangle around the central common building. Other landscaping is minimal. Concrete pedestrian pathways connect the residential buildings to the common building, mail kiosk and parking areas. The buildings are virtually all the same size at two stories apiece in three building types and are spread out evenly from each other. They are designed in a non-descript contemporary style with flat concrete roof tiles, hip roofs, stucco plaster finish, and aluminum frame sliding windows. The only architectural detailing on the building plans is the trellis work on the 3 br units. Exposed concrete block half walls surround the patios. The building will be painted and the woodwork is intended to be stained. Painted wood/glass doors lead to the patios. There are skylights above the staircases in the 3 and 4 br units.

Planning and Development Issues:

Both this parcel and the residential townhouses to the south required a residential density transfer from parcel R-7 to parcel R-6, which required an amendment to the general development plan for Rancho Del Rey. No zone change was required for this project however. This project complied fully with zoning and development standards and only required zoning administrator and Development Review Committee (DRC) approval. While this project sailed through the development approvals process, the project to the south was not so lucky (see other Case study). The vacant project site was tiered off EIR 89-10, which was prepared for the larger Rancho Del Rey development. The initial study for this project indicated the presence of both coastal sage scrub and the endangered gnatcatcher, grading and landform issues, and traffic, air quality, and public facilities impacts.

Key Project Adjustments:

Few changes were made to this project through the approvals process: six visitor parking spaces were required on top of the mandated resident parking; trash enclosure enhancement; a revised Landscape plan; a project entry sign; and a resubmittal of project colors. Fees were collected for a variety of impacts, including: sewer capacity fees, development impact fees, and traffic signal fees. After DRC approval of the project, the applicant requested a reduction in the number of required parking spaces, which was granted with assurance that the parking scheme would be altered if the need ever arose.

Approval Chronology: (important approval dates in bold)

16 Oct 96	Development Permit Processing Agreement;
16 Oct 96	Disclosure statement submitted;
4 Nov 96	Development Review Committee (DRC) application submitted;
4 Nov 96	Statement of Amount Due from City: \$2000 fee for DRC approval;
4 Nov 96	Tentative Project Schedule worked out with Planning Department;
5 Nov 96	Project routed to agencies by Planning Department—comments due back by 19 Nov 96;
6 Nov 96	Fire Department comments—sprinklers may be required for the residential units;
8 Nov 96	Building Department comments—ADA access applies to project;
13 Nov 96	Environmental comments—project tiered off EIR 89-10 and conforms to it;
14 Nov 96	Public Forum—project presented by Juan Arroyo from Housing Department;
20 Nov 96	Addendum to EIR 89-10 submitted;
22 Nov 96	Engineering Department comments—minor standard comments, and fee outline;

California Department of Housing and Community Development

26 Nov 96 Notice of Public Hearing--for DRC meeting of 9 Dec 96 with mailing list to residents;
29 Nov 96 Staff Report to DRC prepared;
4 Dec 96 Police Department comments—standard security issues: site lighting, secure perimeter, etc;
9 Dec 96 DRC Summary Staff Report—project has attempted to harmonize with surrounding land uses and single family residential areas to the south and east;
9 Dec 96 Development Review Committee meeting and public hearing—project approved by unanimous vote of committee;
9 Dec 96 Planning Department letter to applicant re: project conforms with zoning per zoning administrator;
10 Dec 96 Planning Department letter to applicant re: notification of DRC approval with conditions and minor changes: Landscape plan revision; trash enclosure enhancement; entry signage; color and material revisions; more visitor parking;
27 Jan 97 Planning Department letter to applicant re: second notice of DRC approval;
12 Mar 97 Planning Department letter to applicant re: parking survey and reductions in parking requirements for affordable housing projects;
25 June 97 Building Permit application submitted;
21 July 97 DRC Meeting approved resubmitted color scheme;
29 July 97 Planning Department letter to applicant – re: notification of DRC approval of color scheme, no decision on parking reduction request;
1 Aug 97 applicant letter to Planning Department – re: assurances over project parking with regard to reduction request—parking to be altered if need arises in future;
3 Oct 97 Building Permit issued;
28 Oct 97 Request for direct payment -- \$878.91 refunded to applicant due to fewer staff hours spent on the project than deposited; total planning costs for project approval = \$1121.09;
2 July 98 Building Permit Finaled – construction and project complete.

Total Time for Approvals:

Project Approval by City:	16 Oct 1996 - 9 Dec 1996 = 1.75 months
Building Permit Approval:	25 June 1997 - 3 Oct 1997 = 3.25 months
Building Construction period:	3 Oct 1997 - 2 July 1998 = 10 months

Public Participation / Opposition:

No public participation or opposition by individuals or community groups was noted on the project.

CITY of CHULA VISTA:
Bolero: market-rate condominiums

<i>Project Name</i>	Bolero
<i>Project Location:</i>	1121 N. Cabrillo Drive, Parcel R-6a @ Rancho Del Rey between East J Street and Buena Vista Way south of Cordova Village affordable housing
<i>Developer:</i>	Rancho Del Rey Investors, LP / McMillan Properties 2727 Hoover Avenue, National City California 91950 619 477 4117 Shea Homes 619 421 2181 = sales office: Patty Walker
<i>Owner:</i>	Rancho Del Rey Investors, LP
<i>Project Components:</i>	-240 units on 15.2 acres = 15.79 units per acre -80 buildings with 3 units per building -3 lots in 12 construction phases -single building configuration repeated across the site -2 of 3 units per bldg = townhouses; 3 rd unit is flat w/ garage -unit 1 flat = 2 bd / 2 ba @ 1025 sf + 1 Car gar + 1 open space -unit 2 town = 2 bd / 2.5 ba @ 1135 sf w/ 1 Car gar. + 1 space unit 3 -all buildings are 2 stories -320 garage package w/ 180 uncovered + 40 visitor = 540 total spaces -rec. bldg, recreation area, 3 BBQ / picnic areas, and tot lots
<i>Project Numbers:</i>	APN: 640-090-22 Development Review Committee: DRC 97-01 Tracking No: T 97-053 PCM 97-01 (Planning Commission Miscellaneous--variances) PCS: 97-01 (Planning Commission Subdivision) Initial Study: 96-21 Sectional Planning Area III Amendment to change densities

Project Description:

This project was controversial, primarily because it is a housing type that is new to Chula Vista—and their existing development standards could not easily accommodate the physical needs of the project. This gated condominium project is targeted at new home buyers, with densities approaching apartment developments, but with single family residential amenities. The site is located on Parcel R-6 in the Rancho Del Rey planned community in Sectional Planning Area III. To the south of the project site is open space land and Telegraph Canyon Road; to the north is the Cordova Village affordable housing project (the other Chula Vista Case study in this report); to the northwest are East J Street and the main entrance to the project; to the west are future park and school parcels; and to the east are Buena Vista Way and single family residences. The parcel is oddly shaped due to the contours of the land. For this reason, the site plan is primarily comprised of three distinct loop roads (originally identified as construction phases) with perpendicular surface parking and access driveways coming off them. In addition to covered residential garages for 1/3 of the units, parking is scattered across the site between the buildings. The primary

California Department of Housing and Community Development

gated entrance is from East J Street with a secondary emergency access point at Buena Vista Way. The primary entry is divided with a median strip and call box, with a vehicle turnaround outside of the gates. A short entry drive leads directly to a recreation building, pool, BBQ and open space area on the loop road to Lot 1; Lot 2 is located in the southwest corner; Lot 3 is located in the southeast corner. Pedestrian pathways and sidewalks access all buildings to parking areas. Shea Homes has disregarded the lot layout, and has instead scheduled 12 construction phases across the three lots.

The residences are all located in triplex condominium buildings that are identical across the site. Each building includes two townhouse units and a flat above a 4 Car garage. The buildings are designed in a contemporary Mediterranean style with stucco plaster finish, aluminum windows, and concrete tile roofs. The garages have automatic roll-up garage doors, due to minimal 3'-4' driveways. The units have fenced patios and balconies to the rear, but minimal front and rear yards.

Planning and Development Issues:

The project required a Sectional Planning Area III Amendment to transfer density from parcel R-7c to parcel R-6. Parcel R-7c would be decreased by 100 units to 120 total units. Parcel R-6 would be increased by 58 units from 228 to 286 units. 40 of these units were already approved for the affordable housing site to the north, with 246 units left for this project. The overall SPA III would be reduced by 42 units overall. Only 280 units were eventually approved by the City Council for the two projects—reducing this Case study to 240 units.

Approval of the project also required a subdivision tract approval and several variances from local development standards: PCS and PCM 97-01. These refer to Planning Commission items that the Planning Commission failed to approve, and thus these were taken up with the City Council. Initially the Planning Department, Development Review Committee, and Planning Commission all denied recommendation of the project. The developer appealed all of these denials to the City Council who approved the project with slight changes. Issues of opposition from these bodies included virtually every aspect of the site, architectural and landscape design. Primary concern over the dense nature of the development drove most of the official opposition.

Key Project Adjustments:

The most important project adjustment was the reduction of units from an initial proposal of 270 units in preliminary review down to 240 units with City Council approval—however all of these proposals exceeded allowable densities approved for the parcel in the Sectional Planning Area Plan.

In addition to these changes in the number of units, the Planning and Public Works Departments were able to force many changes to the aesthetics and design of the project. The architecture and Landscape was enhanced; pedestrian and vehicular circulation was improved, the BBQ areas and tot lots were redistributed and improved; trash enclosures were enhanced; finishes and materials were upgraded throughout the project; automatic garage door openers with roll-up garage doors were required; additional geo-technical and drainage reports and an erosion/sedimentation control plan were also mandated.

Approval Chronology: (important approval dates in bold)

22 Apr 96	applicant letter to Planning Department – re: thank you for initial meeting;
24 May 96	Planning Department pre-application comments—many problems with the proposal, including: internal circulation, entry focal point, emergency vehicle access, boundary treatments, parking requirements, pedestrian circulation, siting of tot lots, building separation, building design, landscaping, hardscape treatments; w/ recommended process and approvals: Tentative Tract Map, Special Planning Area Amendment, and Design Review Committee application;
29 June 96	Disclosure Statement submitted;

Multi-family Projects

California Department of Housing and Community Development

3 July 96	Fees paid: \$4000 deposit for SPA Amendment and \$1000 for initial study;
10 July 96	Project Description for SPA III Amendment, describing density transfer from another parcel in the Ranch Del Rey development;
11 July 96	application Submitted for Tentative Tract;
11 July 96	Statement of Amount due sent from Planning Department to applicant;
11 July 96	Development Permit Processing Agreement signed by city and developer;
16 July 96	City Council meeting: Rancho Del Rey SPA III Plan adopted in Resolution. No. 18366 and Planned Community District Regulations in Ordinance No. 2686;
20 Sept 96	\$10,000 fee for tract application & \$2000 for Development Review Committee application paid;
27 Sept 96	Disclosure Statement submitted;
30 Sept 96	Title Report from 1 st America Title Insurance Co.
30 Sept 96	Applications filed for various changes and approvals;
14 Oct 96	Development Review Committee routing to agencies—due back 23 Oct 96;
15 Oct 96	Fire Department comments—standard comments; sprinklers and fire alarm system required;
16 Oct 96	Architectural drawings dated;
21 Oct 96	Addendum to EIR 89-10 for Rancho Del Rey SPA III and Initial Study 97-01 prepared;
22 Oct 96	Notice of Public Forum with Planning Department on 30 Oct 96;
23 Oct 96	Project routed to agencies for comment—due back by 5 Dec 96;
23 Oct 96	Meeting with applicant to discuss Development Review Committee comments that were submitted by agencies;
28 Oct 96	Resubmittal by applicant;
undated	Planning Department comments—requirements for: trash enclosures, better vehicular turnarounds, pedestrian circulation, parking distributed too far from units, bbq areas not well defined, buildings are too tightly sited;
undated	Design Review Staff architecture comments (based on the Chula Vista Design Manual and the SPA Design Guidelines)—more varied roof line required, better articulation of the buildings on all sides encouraged, window placement is too random, units are too similar, too little privacy for the units;
28 Oct 96	Sweetwater Union HSD comments—Community Facility District 3 fees required for secondary school impacts;
30 Oct 96	Planning Department Public Forum for Parcel R-6 development proposal;
31 Oct 96	Planning Commission submittal date;
31 Oct 96	Project routed to agencies for comment;
1 Nov 96	Public Works comments—standard + description of fees;
5 Nov 96	Revised processing schedule agreed;
5 Nov 96	Chula Vista ESD comments—project okay;
6 Nov 96	applicant letter to Planning Department – re: responses to Development Review Committee staff architectural comments;
8 Nov 96	Fire Department comments—need more information, yet there are access problems with the gates;
11 Nov 96	Development Review Committee Summary Staff Report: paired with development of Cordova Village site;
18 Nov 96	Planning Department staff meeting to discuss project;
18 Nov 96	Public Works / Engineering comments and conditions of approval submitted;
18 Nov 96	Development Review Committee meeting: denial of the project —committee likes the architecture but not the site plan, building separation or the lack of landscaping; committee unanimously votes to deny recommendation of the project; Committee cites nonconformance with the city's design standards as the criteria for denial; developer suggests the decision will be appealed to the Planning Commission;
21 Nov 96	Development Review Committee Appeal application filed;
21 Nov 96	Subdivision conference held; /
21 Nov 96	Market Feasibility Analysis by REEB;

California Department of Housing and Community Development

25 Nov 96	Applicant letter to Planning Department re: scheduling of public hearings and Planning Commission meeting;
26 Nov 96	Draft SPA III Amendment submitted;
27 Nov 96	Notice of Public Hearing for Planning Commission meeting of 11 Dec 96;
5 Dec 96	Otay Water District comments—minor;
5 Dec 96	Draft Staff Report forwarded to applicant;
11 Dec 96	Engineering comments and conditions submitted to Planning Department;
11 Dec 96	Planning Department Staff Report to Planning Commission—unresolved issues remain; staff recommends denial of the project, Tentative Tract Map and SPA III Amendment; Developer had asked for transfer of too many additional units to this site—staff agrees to a 29 unit transfer only; 42 Conditions of Approval prepared that are based on existing development standards that would force a complete redesign of the project; Staff, however, could not make the required findings to recommend approval of the project;
11 Dec 96	Planning Commission meeting to hear appeal of Development Review Committee decision; Planning Commission fails to approve project; Developers, market analysts, and Shea Homes representatives present project and answer questions. Although they didn't like the architecture, the Planning Commission generally likes the project and suggests the issues aren't insurmountable; one of the commissioners moved to deny the Planning Staff recommendation and support the project with further work and revisions—the vote is 2-2 and the motion fails; the Commission fails to approve the project; Developer has the option to resubmit the project (start over) or go the City Council without a Planning Commission recommendation; the developer opts for the latter alternative;
9 Jan 97	Notice of Public Hearing – re: City Council meeting of 21 Jan 97; later continued to 4 Feb 97;
15 Jan 97	Letter of opposition from Dr. Albert C. Funk;
4 Feb 97	City Council Meeting: project discussed with Planning Department, developers, and other officials; open space, building separations, and pedestrian circulation are identified as key issues; The developer offers the removal of 6 units / 2 buildings to free up some space in the development—staff wants 4 buildings eliminated instead—developer does not agree to this; developer suggests they originally wanted 270 units on this site, but have already compromised down to 246; Council votes 4-0-1 to approve project contingent on staff working with the developer over the next two weeks before the next council meeting to work out the details and issues that still remain unresolved; continued to 18 Feb 97;
5 Feb 97	Draft SPA III Amendment revised;
11 Feb 97	Park, Recreation & Open Space comments—security and nuisance concerns due to gates;
undated	Planning Department and developers meet to discuss project changes;
18 Feb 97	City Council meeting: project approved after changes are made to the site plan and unit count; Rancho Del Rey SPA III Plan adopted in Resolution. No. 18570 and Planned Community District Regulations in Ordinance No. 2698—to change densities of parcels for Rancho Del Rey; PCM-, PCS-, and DRC-97-01 approved; Staff presents a revised site plan with a more comprehensive pedestrian circulation system and more sidewalks, the removal of 2 buildings reducing the project to 240 units, and new Conditions of Approval that better reflect the needs of the project; Staff recommends approval of the project; no opposition from the public is voiced; the City Council was still not happy with the lack of vehicular accessibility to the site and suggested the City Attorney draft a new condition allowing the revisitation of this issue at a later date; extensive site specific findings are included in the resolutions and ordinances; several General Conditions are followed by 72 site specific Conditions of Approval including the following: mitigation monitoring, additional Geo-technical and drainage reports, an erosion/sedimentation control plan, dedication of open space to the city, assessments for an Open Space District 20, various easements, private maintenance of project streets and open space areas through CC&Rs, various development standards, and automatic garage door openers with roll-up garage doors;
14 May 97	Building Permit application date for models;
16 Sept 97	Building Permits issued for models;

California Department of Housing and Community Development

Aug 98 Project in construction, continuing.

Total Time for Approvals:

Preliminary Planning Department Review:	April 1996 - May 24, 1996 = 1 month
Project Approval by City:	11 July 1996 - 18 Feb 1997 = 7 months
Master Building Permit Approval:	14 May 1997 - 16 Sept 1997 = 4 months
Building Construction period:	16 Sept 1997 - Aug 1998, continuing

Public Participation / Opposition:

There was little public opposition from community groups or individuals to the project. However there was much opposition to the project from official bodies as described above.

CITY of CUPERTINO:
The Hamptons: market-rate apartments

Project Name: The Hamptons

Project Location: 10750 Wolfe Road
Between Pruneridge Avenue, Wolfe Road and the I-280 Freeway

Developer: Irvine Apartment Communities

Thompson Residential Co. Inc.
591 Redwood Highway Ste. 2575, Mill Valley California 94941
415 381 3001

Owner: Tandem Computers

Project Components: -342 residential units on 13.39 acres = 25.54 units per acre
-several different unit types and sizes throughout development
Unit A: 142 units – 1 bdrm flat, 1 ba, from 700 sf to 736 sf
Unit B: 105 units – 2 bdrm flat, 2 ba, from 966 sf to 1061 sf
Unit B1: 39 units – 2 bdrm town, 2 ba, from 1100 sf to 1116 sf
Unit C: 30 units – 3 bdrm town, 2 ba, from 1206 sf to 1275 sf
Unit C1: 26 units – 3 bdrm flat, 2 ba, from 1300 sf to 1386 sf
-684 total parking spaces: 342 covered & 342 uncovered
-various community amenities, including: 3 play areas, 4 family picnic areas, an Olympic size lap pool, spa, par course, volleyball court, ½ acre playing field, basketball court, putting green, fitness center, lounge, business center, teen center, and a community room.

Project Numbers: APNs: 316-06-031, -032, -037
Rezone: 5-Z-96
Negative Declaration / Environmental Assessment: 23-EA-96 / 21-EA-96
General Plan Amendment: 4-GPA-96-6
Use Permit: 14-U-96

Project Consultants: Civil Engineering: Humann Company Inc.
Architecture: Seidel / Holzman

Project Description:

This gated community apartment complex is located in north-eastern Cupertino along Interstate 280 near the Vallco Fashion Park regional shopping mall. The parcel is irregularly shaped and is not aligned directly to any cardinal direction. To the northwest of the project site is Wolfe Road; to the southwest is Interstate 280; to the southeast is an adjacent light industrial building; and to the north and northeast is Pruneridge Avenue. A single vehicular access point is located at the center of the parcel along Pruneridge Avenue. This main entry point leads to a loop road that circles the site behind a series of residential buildings fronting on Pruneridge. A secondary emergency vehicle access and egress point is located to the south of the property, discharging to an easement on the adjacent parcel at Interstate 280. Except for these three street frontage buildings, all other residential buildings are internal to the loop road, with parking and Carports located to the periphery of this central residential cluster,

California Department of Housing and Community Development

which is composed of seven buildings. The Carports are scattered amongst the uncovered parking throughout the development. Larger surface parking areas are located in the northern and southern corners of the site.

The primary vehicular entrance visually ends at a “T” intersection along the loop road. Opposite this main entrance is located a large stair that accesses the main courtyard and the recreation and community buildings to either side of it. The central residential cluster surrounds most of these recreational and community amenities. A 15’ emergency access way through the central courtyard has been provided to access those units fronting on this courtyard. The 10 residential buildings are roughly of the same design. They are all “J” shaped buildings with 30 - 36 units per building. The project is designed in a simplified, contemporary vernacular style. The buildings all have gable end roofs and are composed of various volumetric elements and pop-outs. The buildings are finished in hardboard siding, asphalt composition shingles, metal 4-square windows, and wood fascias. Some of the units have balconies, patios, and/or trellises. The metal balcony railings and trimwork are intended to be painted in contrasting colors. Some of the windows have awnings. Fenced patios and CMU planter boxes surround the buildings. The site is fully irrigated and landscaped.

Planning and Development Issues:

The project required a rezone from Planned Industrial use to Planned Residential Use. The site had originally been part of the Tandem Computers Campus. When Tandem was bought by Compaq, plans for the Campus were altered. The project site was vacant at the time of application.

A General Plan amendment was also required to increase the allowed housing density of the area under Cupertino’s Housing Allocation System. In the 1979s and 1980s, Cupertino had overbuilt its retail uses, which brought significantly more traffic into the area than expected and forced various General Plan responses. The Housing allocation System was put into effect as a result of the 1993 General Plan update. This system provided for fixed housing unit numbers rather than zoned densities in historically non-residential areas of the city, while maintaining the city’s overall transportation level of service. The project site is located in an area under the jurisdiction of the Vallco Park Planning Area special plan, which is a component of the General Plan. This plan limits the number of housing units per parcel in an area on a first-come, first-served basis. The Hamptons was vying for units against another nearby project at the time of application. The General Plan amendment requested an increase in the number of allowable housing units from 500 units to 550 units for the area, which would allow both projects to proceed with a reduced unit count. Because of these housing quotas, the unit count on the project changed throughout the entitlements process.

The developer initially requested 366 units during preliminary review. By June 1996 the project was reduced to 348 units; by August 1996 the final 342 units was proposed and agreed to by the Planning Department staff. This allowed the other project to proceed with 208 units.

This project required two environmental reviews: 21 EA 96 for the project itself and 23 EA 96 for the General Plan Amendment to the Vallco Park Planning Area unit increase. Mitigated Negative Declarations were certified for each environmental assessment.

Because of Cupertino’s affordable housing requirement, 10% of the units were set aside as below market rate affordable units.

Midway through the entitlements process, Irvine Apartment Communities purchased the project from Thompson Residential.

Key Project Adjustments:

Comments from relevant service providers and agencies were generally of a standard nature. Various impact and assessment district fees were required by a variety of agencies. Notable is the relatively large parks fee that

Multi-family Projects

California Department of Housing and Community Development

Cupertino charges per unit; \$6480 per multi-family unit / \$15,750 per single family unit. Staff requested the addition of turf play areas and tot lots—in addition to developer proposed recreational amenities, which included the recreation center, swimming pool, and family picnic areas—which cut the developer's park fee in half. This number was reduced in 1998 to \$3240 per unit due to the provision of various additional recreational amenities that are noted in the chronology below. This park's fee is still higher than most other jurisdictions in this survey. Also, additional cost requests from Public Works resulted in a cost sharing plan for improvements to adjacent access roads.

The Planning Commission and Planning Department requested many other design changes through the life of the approval process. Early in the approvals process, staff requested additional work on pedestrian circulation and redesign of the entry tower element. This entry feature was later eliminated from the project entirely. Midway through the entitlements process, and after considerable review by staff, the Planning Commission requested the architects go back and provide three redesigned alternatives based on various building elevations, rotations and setbacks. This added considerable time and cost to the project. Because of this request, changes were made to the site plan, buildings were reduced in height, relocated and redesigned. The Planning Commission requested more diversity in the elevations, pitched roofs on the Carports rather than flat roofs, additional recreational amenities, and additional architectural articulation and detailing to the buildings. The developer requested a reduction in the parking requirements of 2 spaces per unit to 1.8 spaces per unit. This request was rejected.

The single vehicular access point at Pruneridge Avenue was a sticking point for emergency service providers. Since the short street frontage along Pruneridge was impacted by the distance to the very heavily trafficked Wolfe Road intersection to the northwest, a second access and egress point had to be located elsewhere along the property boundary. Fortunately the developer already had easement rights to a secondary access road in the far southerly corner of the site adjacent to I-280. This secondary access road discharges to Ridgeview Court which connects to Pruneridge Avenue.

Approval Chronology: (important approval dates in bold)

Feb 96	applicant begins discussions with Planning Department;
6 June 96	Pre-application meeting with applicant and Planning Staff;
25 June 96	Pre-application meeting with applicant and Planning Staff – request for fast track approval and early feedback; request for 1.8 parking spaces per unit rather than 2 spaces as required;
3 July 96	Submittal letter from applicant with filing fee of \$2250;
10 July 96	Pre-application meeting with applicant and Planning Staff – request for early agency comments prior to application submittal;
10 July 96	Agency Coordination meeting with comments sent to applicant;
20 July 96	Tree Survey and Preservation recommendations from Barrie D. Coate and Associates;
31 July 96	Acoustical Evaluation by Wilson Ihring & Associates;
31 July 96	Architect's drawings submitted to Planning Commission for review;
31 July 96	applications submitted for zone change and project
2 Aug 96	Planning Department letter to applicant – re: project approval meetings scheduled; receipt of application confirmed;
8 Aug 96	Environmental Review Committee meeting: land use in compliance; recommended Mitigated Negative Declaration;
8 Aug 96	Notice of Public Hearing for Planning Commission meeting of 9 Sept 96;
9 Aug 96	Planning Department Environmental Assessment completed and Mitigated Negative Declaration recommended; issues include the following: soil disruption, sewage, water quality, trees in conflict with construction;
9 Aug 96	Cupertino Unified School District comments –increased students acceptable due to availability of space within District;
12 Aug 96	Fire Department comments – standard;
14 Aug 96	Pre-hearing review meeting;

California Department of Housing and Community Development

14 Aug 96 Planning Department letter to applicant – re: redesign entry tower element and rework pedestrian circulation;

14 Aug 96 Public Works comments – various fees outlined, including: parks fee of \$6480 / unit; \$1744 deposit for plan check inspection; storm drainage fee of \$37,324; map check fees of \$381; development maintenance fee of \$3000; street light power fee of \$75 / light; grading permit @ 5% of site improvement cost;

15 Aug 96 Environmental Review meeting;

20 Aug 96 Planning Department letter to applicant – re: Planning Commission meeting scheduled;

20 Aug 96 Agency referral list from Planning Department;

26 Aug 96 Sheriff's comments – traffic impacts and law enforcement issues;

27 Aug 96 Architect's drawings submitted to Planning Commission for review;

3 Sept 96 Planning Department letter to Parks Department – re: request for further review by their Department;

9 Sept 96 Planning Commission meeting: project introduced and discussed; project is consistent with General Plan land use provisions; it complies with noise standards; no contaminated soil or groundwater; continued to meeting of 25 Sept 96;

18 Sept 96 Park comments – project okay;

20 Sept 96 Cupertino Unified School District comments – district boundary adjustment with the Santa Clara Unified School District still unresolved;

20 Sept 96 Cupertino Unified School District letter to applicant – re: property transfer from Tandem to school district;

25 Sept 96 Staff Report to Planning Commission: recommended approval on all permits;

25 Sept 96 Santa Clara Unified School District comments – project okay, student increase acceptable;

25 Sept 96 Planning Commission meeting: project site de-annexed from Cupertino Unified School District and annexed into Santa Clara Unified School District; design concerns with views, setbacks, landscaping, and repetitive building design; project discussed and continued to meeting of 28 Oct 96;

7 Oct 96 City Council meeting: use permit, Negative Declaration, and rezone discussed and continued to next meeting on 4 Nov 96;

11 Oct 96 Traffic Analysis by Barton-Aschman Associates; no Significant impacts anticipated;

18 Oct 96 Notice of Public Hearing for Planning Commission meeting of 28 Oct 96;

23 Oct 96 Parking Survey by Barton-Aschman Associates;

28 Oct 96 Planning Commission meeting: three proposals presented due to previous design concerns of commissioners; project discussed further and continued to meeting of 12 Nov 96;

4 Nov 96 City Council meeting: project discussed and continued to next meeting on 18 Nov 96;

12 Nov 96 Planning Commission meeting: project approved; Negative Declaration and 23-EA-96 approved; General Plan amendment 4 GPA 96-7 to amend Vallco housing cap of 500 units raised to 550 units; several resolutions passed, including use permit, and project with conditions of approval; parking requirement maintained at 2 per unit; many concerns about project design are still unresolved, including: pitched roofs on Carports, parking, access to the site, lowered elevation heights at the periphery, repetitive architecture, and on-site amenities respective of density; the project passed by a slim 3-2-0 margin;

14 Nov 96 Planning Department letter to applicant – re: notification of Planning Commission decision and prep for City Council meeting of 18 Nov 96;

15 Nov 96 applicant and Santa Clara County Board of education meet to discuss boundary adjustment between school districts;

18 Nov 96 City Council meeting: project discussed and continued to next meeting on 2 Dec 96;

2 Dec 96 Architect's drawings submitted to City Council for review;

2 Dec 96 City Council meeting: project discussed and continued to CC meeting of 11 Dec 96;

6 Dec 96 applicant letter to Mayor and City Council – re: letter of support and lobbying for project; \$2.4 million in fees anticipated;

10 Dec 96 Two letters of support received from residents of Cupertino;

California Department of Housing and Community Development

11 Dec 96	City Council meeting: Negative Declaration certified; project discussed and continued to CC meeting of 6 Jan 97;
16 Dec 96	Planning Department letter to applicant – re: notification of City Council continuation;
19 Dec 96	applicant letter to Planning Department – re: several project additions and design changes have been made as a result of City Council concerns: 2 half-court basketball courts, volleyball court, an outdoor par course, a putting green, and a teen study center; the building heights have been reduced; the finished floor elevations have been lowered 1' across the site; some of the buildings have been rotated; distance between the buildings has been increased;
20 Dec 96	Traffic Analysis revised;
20 Dec 96	applicant resubmittals to City Council;
26 Dec 96	Architect letter to Planning Department – re: amenity list revision;
3 Jan 97	applicant letter to Mayor and City Council – re: additions and design changes; the support of other groups is listed herein, including: the Greenbelt Alliance, Council of Churches, the Housing Action Coalition, the League of Women Voters, Cupertino Unified School District, Tandem Computers, Vallco Shopping Mall, and Hewlett-Packard;
6 Jan 97	Revised Planning Department Staff Report to City Council;
6 Jan 97	City Council meeting: project and all permits approved; General Plan Amendment and Use Permit;
6 Jan 97	De Minimus Impact Finding and Certificate of Fee Exemption from California Department of Fish and Game;
17 Jan 97	applicant letter to Mayor and City Council – re: letter of support for second reading;
21 Jan 97	City Council meeting: 2nd reading of rezoning and project approval; no further comments; project effective;
28 Jan 97	Planning Department letter to applicant – re: notification of City Council approval of project; all permits approved;
19 May 97	Building Permit application submitted;
2 June 97	Park fee confirmation letter to applicant – re: fees of \$997,920;
3 June 97	Public Works letter to applicant – re: cost sharing for street improvements; traffic signal condition modification;
30 June 97	Building Permit comments from Planning Department;
17 July 97	Building Permits issued;
4 Aug 97	Architect's drawings submitted to City Council for review;
20 Aug 97	Project meeting with applicant, Planning Department, Public Works, consultants;
27 Aug 97	Architect letter to Planning Department – re: entry tower element eliminated from project;
25 Sept 97	Architect's drawings submitted to City Council for review;
13 Oct 97	Planning Department progress letter to applicant;
23 Oct 97	Architect's drawings submitted to City Council for review;
18 Nov 97	Architect's drawings submitted to City Council for review;
8 Dec 97	Color samples submitted to Planning Department for review;
8 Dec 97	applicant letter to City Council and Mayor – re: color board revision;
17 June 98	50% reduction in park fees approved due to provision of recreational amenities on site; (see 2 June 97)
Aug 98	Project still in construction; expected completion last quarter of 98;

Total Time for Approvals:

Preliminary Review by City:	Feb 1996 - 31 July 1996 = 6 months
Project Approval by City:	31 July 1996 - 21 Jan 1997 = 5.75 months
Building Permit Approval:	19 May 1997 - 17 July 1997 = 2 months
Building Construction Period:	17 July 1997 - Aug 1998 = 13.5 months, continuing

Public Participation / Opposition:

Little opposition from neighbors and other groups was noted in the project file. The developer secured support for the project from a variety of organizations: the Greenbelt Alliance, the Council of Churches, the Housing Action Coalition, the League of Women Voters, the Cupertino Unified School District, Tandem Computers, Vallco Shopping Mall, and Hewlett-Packard. The perception of severe housing shortages for employees and families in the north county area is considered to be the reason for this widespread support.

CITY of FAIRFIELD:
Fairfield Park: market-rate apartments

<i>Project Name:</i>	Fairfield Park Apartments
<i>Project Location:</i>	west side of Pennsylvania Ave. near James & Lawrence Streets north of highway 12 in central Fairfield, south of downtown
<i>Developer:</i>	CBM Group, Inc. 1010 Racquet Club Drive Ste 103, Auburn California 95603 916 823 5240 x3047
<i>Owner:</i>	Fairfield Pennsylvania Association, General Partners 3222 Winona, North Highlands California 95660 916 349 7242
<i>Project Components:</i>	-60 units on 3.61 acres = 16.6 units / acre -total building area: 60,176 sf -5 building configurations with various combinations of units -32 two bdrm units @ 842 sf ea, single story flats -24 three bdrm units @ 1156 sf ea, single story flats -4 four bdrm units @ 1360 sf ea, 2 stories ea -total parking spaces = 126 -60 Carport parking spaces (distributed amongst other parking) -4 handicap parking spaces -62 uncovered parking spaces -residential buildings two and three stories -small single story laundry, office, and maintenance building -play areas, basketball court, tot lot between parking and units
<i>Project Numbers:</i>	APN: 031-170-34 Development Plan 378
<i>Project Consultants:</i>	Architecture: Architectural Division of the CBM Group

Project Description:

This apartment project on the edge of the developed area of central Fairfield was viewed by the Planning Department and the City as a gateway project to the City from Highway 12. The project site was vacant land covered with grasses. To the north and west of the project site are single family residences; to the east is Pennsylvania Avenue; to the south is vacant land and some jurisdictional wetlands. The project site is a thin rhomboid shape with the units along the south side, surrounded by parking and an access drive on the north, east and west sides of the units. Vehicular access to the project is from Pennsylvania Ave from the east and Lawrence Street, from the north. Carports and uncovered parking spaces are intermingled along the double-loaded access drive. A 6' wooden fence surrounds the project on all sides.

The housing project consists of 60 units in 10 buildings of 5 various configurations. The buildings are arranged in two long rows with a central pathway serving as an organizing axis for the development, with pathways to the individual units. The four bedroom units are configured as duplex townhouses and are two stories each. They are located to either side of the common laundry building near Pennsylvania Ave, where the basketball court and tot

California Department of Housing and Community Development

lot are also located. The two and three bedroom units are stacked flats in two and three story walk up buildings with exterior stairs. The buildings are connected to each other and the parking area by concrete paths set into lawn. The buildings are constructed in a contemporary vernacular of inexpensive building materials. The roof is covered in asphalt shingles and the walls are sheathed in various hardboard sidings and stucco plaster. A hardboard siding wainscot ties all of the buildings together stylistically. The windows are predominantly double hung aluminum windows, with a smaller percentage of sliding windows. Foam and wood trim has been mandated around all windows and doors. Decorative circular attic vents are located centrally at the gable ends. The project is to be painted in tans, off whites, and other warm earth tones with dark green trim.

Planning and Development Issues:

No rezone was required for the project, as it had been designated High Density Residential in the City's General Plan; and R:M-T2 Residential—multiple / transitional under current zoning.

The project required minor grading to lift the units 12" above the 100 year flood plain designation of the project site. This required the grading and import of 5900 cy of soil. Due to this grading, the developer also was mandated to get a map revision letter and flood plain redesignation from FEMA. Also, an open concrete-lined drainage ditch on the site required under-grounding.

The location of this project required additional meetings with the community to assuage their concerns over multi-family housing projects.

The Planning Department and Planning Commission had various concerns over the aesthetics of the project and conformance of the project to the city's Urban Design Plan. The developer tried to come in with a very inexpensive, stripped-down project that was unacceptable to staff. This resulted in a protracted Planning Commission schedule, where the project was continued through several meetings.

Key Project Adjustments:

In the process of agency comments a few additions were made to the project, including: adjacent street, curb and sidewalk improvements, redesign of the elevations to enhance aesthetics, more visitor parking, Landscape enhancement, and the addition of fire sprinklers. Aesthetic changes are detailed below.

In meetings with neighbors, the wood fence around the project on the north and west boundaries adjacent to single family residences was upgraded to CMU construction and increased from 6' to 8' high.

Various city-wide fees were paid over the approval process of this project, including: park fees, Capital Improvement Fees, school fees, and other prerequisite building/planning permit and review fees.

Approval Chronology: (important approval dates in bold)

7 Feb 89	Land acquired by owner;
19 Dec 91	Wetlands Report completed;
16 June 97	Architectural drawings dated; colors changed to grey-blue and white;
18 June 97	Public Hearing Notice;
2 May 97	Architectural drawings date; colors include tan-green scheme;
15 July 97	Project application received with fee of \$3533 for development review;
16 July 97	Wetlands Report of 10 Dec 91 submitted to Planning Department: no wetlands identified on property although some exist on the parcel to the south;
22 July 97	Development Coordinating Report by Planning Department;
8Aug 97	Plans submitted by CBM to Planning Department;

Multi-family Projects

California Department of Housing and Community Development

8 Aug 97	Environmental Noise Analysis by Brown-Buntin Associates;
12 Aug 97	School District letter mandating fees at time of building permit;
19 Aug 97	Environmental Checklist form completed by Planning Department – no Significant impacts noted;
25 Aug 97	CBM Project Management Plan submitted – contains lease agreements, CC&Rs, and house rules for tenants;
29 Aug 97	General Development Conditions prepared;
10 Sept 9	Planning Commission meeting and public hearing: Resolution. No. 97-36 brought up to certify Negative Declaration and grant Development Review approval to project; with Draft Conditions of Approval attached. Conditions are extensive and detail building and Landscape materials, enhanced aesthetics and landscaping and other standard conditions. Much discussion over architectural aesthetics and colors occurred, along with discussion over the flood plain designation, the height of the masonry wall around the project, crime, and the positioning of the project as a gateway to the city. Discussion continued to next Planning Commission meeting of 24 Sept 97;
17 Sept 97	Neighborhood Meeting held to let neighbors discuss the project with staff: The neighbors are concerned about a multi-family project next to their single family residences and the crime and safety concerns this brings. Changes requested and agreed, include: the addition of a masonry wall rather than a wood fence along the north and west property boundaries at 8' rather than 6' as proposed, and assurance of fencing at the vehicle turnaround in the corner of the project;
24 Sept 97	Planning Commission meeting: continued discussion from last meeting to the next meeting on 8 Oct 97; architectural design issues still unresolved – staff has problems with the all-over stucco finish of the project and the lack of detailing;
8 Oct 97	Planning Commission meeting: continued discussion from last meeting to the next meeting on 22 Oct 97;
mid Oct	Planning Department meeting with developer to suggest specific design recommendations; agreements are reached over the addition of hardboard siding to better articulate volumes, the use of double-hung windows, the addition of wainscot around all buildings, trim around the windows and doors, and decorative vents – in exchange for removal of restrictive language in the Conditions of Approval with respect to aesthetics;
22 Oct 97	Planning Commission meeting: project approved, Negative Declaration certified and final Conditions of Approval reviewed and modified, re: watering down of items related to architectural aesthetics and building colors; Commission suggests early tree planting; some concern over colors and aesthetics still exists;
29 Oct 97	Environmental Filing Fee paid to Solano County -- \$1275;
8 Dec 97	Public Works letter to applicant – re: plan check proceeding, yet several issues are still unresolved with regard to street improvements and allowable reimbursement amounts;
16 Dec 97	City Council meeting adopts Resolution No. RA 97-39 approving emergency vehicle access turn around easement at project site of Fairfield Park Apartments;
29 Dec 97	Easement Agreement between the Redevelopment Agency and Fairfield Park Apartments concerning Fire Department access and turn around space;
12 Jan 98	Easement Agreement signed by applicant and forwarded to city;
4 Mar 98	Building Permit application date and plan submittal;
29 Mar 98	Plan check comments returned to applicant from Building Department and associated review agencies; requirement for full fire sprinklering;
31 Mar 98	Building Permits issued for all residential buildings; total fees for building permits and associated assessments are paid, including laundry building = \$1,321, 233.57 which works out to \$22,020.56 / unit for building permits and assessments;
2 June 98	Building Permit for laundry building pulled;
Aug 98	Project in construction;

California Department of Housing and Community Development

Total Time for Approvals:

Planning Approval by City:	15 July 1997 - 22 Oct 1997 = 3.25 months
Building Permit Approval:	4 Mar 1998 - 31 Mar 1998 = 1 month
Building Construction Period:	31 Mar 1998 - Aug 1998= 4.5 months, continuing

Public Participation / Opposition:

Some degree of public participation and opposition by individuals or community groups was noted on the project. Meetings were held with the Planning Department to iron out issues related to the placement of a multi-family housing project in a single family neighborhood. Concerns over safety and the fencing of the project were addressed in the course of these meetings. The Planning Department also posed some degree of opposition to the project vis-a-vis the aesthetics and materials proposed under the initial submission. These also were resolved through agreements with the developer.

CITY of FREMONT:
Alborada: market-rate apartments

Project Name:	Alborada Apartments
Project Location:	Southeast of Galludet Avenue in central Fremont
Developer:	SNK Multi-Family Inc. 4 Embarcadero Center, Ste. 3700, San Francisco California 94111 415 433 0701
Owner:	Dividend Fremont Partners 275 Saratoga Avenue Ste. 105, Santa Clara California
Project Components:	-442 units on 18 acres = 24.55 units / acre -18 buildings of various unit configuration -building type 1: 3 buildings with 34 units ea. -building type 2: 5 buildings with 24 units ea. -building type 3: 10 buildings with 22 units ea. -5 unit types -36 one bdrm / one ba @ 747 sf ea. -190 one bdrm / one ba @ 792 sf ea. -108 two bdrm / two ba @ 1057 sf ea. -60 two bdrm / two ba @ 1065 sf ea. -48 three bdrm / three ba @ 1511 sf ea. -884 total parking spaces: 154 garage, 288 Carport, 442 uncovered -one leasing / managers office building -two recreation centers, each with a swimming pool
Project Numbers:	APNs: 507-0804-2, -3, -4, -5 EIA: 97-7 P-82-7E / P-97-1
Project Consultants:	Architecture: HDO Architects & Planners

Project Description:

This multi-family apartment project is located in the central planning area of Fremont, in an area occupied almost completely by other apartment and condominium complexes. The site is an “L” shaped parcel with the intersection of the two arms of the “L” to the south. To the southwest of the project site are Guardino Drive and the Redhawk Apartment complex; to the northwest are the Walnut Place Condominiums and an LDS church parking lot. The Andalusia Apartments are located between the two arms of the “L” along Galludet Drive. To the northeast is Galludet Drive and the main entrance to the project site; and to the southeast of the project site are the Sun Pointe Apartments.

The project is a private gated community, with private streets, and two vehicular entrances located at Galludet Drive to the southeast, and a third emergency access point at Guardino Drive at the southernmost point of the project site. The leasing and management office, visitor parking and a water feature are located at the main entrance. The buildings are laid out in a cluster fashion with parking and driveways between the clusters. Four

primary clusters of varying numbers of units and buildings appear as islands within the large parking areas surrounding them. The recreation buildings and swimming pools are located at the centers of two of the clusters in the southernmost cluster and at the northeast side of the largest middle cluster.

The Carports and largest parking areas have been located at the perimeter of the project. Only some of the units have garage parking at ground level beneath the units. Carports and uncovered parking areas are dispersed primarily at the perimeter of the project site, and at the edges of the clusters. Although the building elevations are presented as distinct entities virtually devoid of garage frontages, the placement of pocket parking, the few garages, and Carports at the edges of the clusters ensures that parking areas will dominate the building elevations. Only from inside the courtyards will residents be able to distance themselves from the parking areas.

The buildings are designed in an austere contemporary Mediterranean style with multi-colored stucco finishes, concrete roof tiles, large horizontal aluminum sash windows, roll-up garage doors, and large sliding patio doors at the balconies. The buildings have few details, save for small tile accents, wainscot banding and thin horizontal trim banding used to break up large expanses of stucco. The buildings have uniform hipped roofs across the project site.

Planning and Development Issues:

The project site falls under the jurisdiction of the Fremont Central Planning Area and fully conformed to this area plan and the General Plan. Existing zoning for the site was adequate; designated high-density residential HDR-23-27 dwelling units per acre allowed.

The project was previously approved in 1982 by the City Council as a Preliminary and Precise Planned District P-82-1 to allow the development of several hundred units within a planned apartment district. This district included the Sun Pointe Apartments, the Walnut Terrace Condominiums, and the Andalusia Apartments. The approvals for this planned district allowed density transfers amongst the sites.

Originally the Andalusia project took up both this project site and the 7.4 acres of its current site for a total of 25.4 acres. The developer of this 25.4 acre site went bankrupt in the early 1990s. The parcel was then split into two projects in the mid-1990s and the larger 18 acre site was sold to the current developer. Only 64 units of an allowed 104 units were eventually built on the Andalusia site, with 40 units still pending. Initially a total of 589 units were approved for both sites in 1988. The current proposal reduces that total to 546 units; allowing for the 104 Andalusia units and the 442 Alborada units.

During the entitlements process, a lot line adjustment was required between the Andalusia project and this one, due to the need to separate utilities, irrigation lines, and parking areas.

The project was tiered off the city's 1991 General Plan EIR and received a mitigated neg. dec. from the Planning Department.

Key Project Adjustments:

Comments from relevant service providers and agencies were of a standard nature. Few physical changes were made to the project in the process of collecting agency comments.

The Planning Department and Planning Commission, however, required extensive redesign and many changes to the project. The Planning Department forced a complete exterior redesign of the project for the buildings and Carports, as they lacked visual identity. Pedestrian access ways were required through the project without crossing parking areas. Due to the large amount of hardscaped area, and the requirement of a designated Car wash area, drainage of the site was required to be filtered. A separate drainage system for the Car wash area was required to be tied into the sanitary sewer system.

Multi-family Projects

California Department of Housing and Community Development

Fees for the project seem to have been of a standard nature. The applicant and school district entered into an independent project impact mitigation agreement.

No change in the unit count was noted in the project file through the course of the approvals process.

Approval Chronology: (important planning dates in bold)

15 Mar 88	City Council approves Preliminary and Precise Plan Ordinance No. 1812 approving previous project;
21 June 96	Land survey completed by surveyor;
3 July 96	Planning Department letter to applicant – re: confirmation of receipt of application;
25 July 96	Letter of Endorsement to Planning Department from project’s architect, Landscape architect, engineer and surveyor;
26 July 96	application submitted to Planning Department;
26 July 96	Architect’s drawings dated;
26 July 96	applicant letters to Planning Department -- re: letter of consent to combine all review processes concurrently;
29 July 96	\$4800 deposit to Planning Department for project review; estimated staff input at 54 hours; \$1057.89 deposited additionally for EIA review; estimated EIA inputs at 19.5 hours;
29 July 96	EIA Questionnaire filled out by applicant and submitted;
31 July 96	Project routed to agencies for comment and notice of meeting on 8 Aug 96;
8 Aug 96	Agency technical coordination meeting to review project;
19 Aug 96	Staff meeting with applicant – re: preliminary review of project;
26 Aug 96	Planning Department Subcommittee meeting: departmental concerns delineated, including: complete lack of visual identity for the project—Department asks for complete redesign to create pedestrian passages without crossing parking areas; roofline problems—too linear, too uninteresting; Carport problems—too linear and unadorned; pedestrian circulation plan required; more building articulation and detailing required;
27 Aug 96	PG&E comments—all services available to site;
3 Sept 96	Browning Ferris comments: none;
6 Sept 96	Project routed to agencies for environmental comments; due back by 26 Sept 96;
6 Sept 96	Initial Study completed; Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration prepared;
16 Sept 96	Notice of Public Hearing for Planning Commission meeting of 26 Sept 96;
16 Sept 96	Santa Clara Valley Transportation Agency comments: none;
25 Sept 96	Meeting between Andalusia Home Owners Association and applicant – re: agreement reached on a fence between the projects; lighting and irrigation lines are to be capped at the shared property line; a tree easement is agreed; and emergency gates are to be installed at vehicular access points;
26 Sept 96	Andalusia Home Owners Association letter to applicant – re: confirming agreements reached at the meeting yesterday;
26 Sept 96	PG&E comments; same as previous;
26 Sept 96	Statement of no hazardous wastes on site filed;
26 Sept 96	Planning Commission meeting: project approved and recommended to Council; no opposition to the project from the public; Preliminary and Precise Plan amendments approved; Carport design changes and some minor site plan revisions requested to increase visual interest for the project; color boards reviewed and approved; EIA assessed and recommended for certification by Council; minimal findings provided—GP and municipal code conformance; conditions of approval approved, including: extensive drainage separation and filtering, Native America observer required on site during grading; Car wash area required with filtering system hooked up to sanitary sewer; project passed Planning Commission unanimously;

California Department of Housing and Community Development

27 Sept 96	Planning Department letter to applicant – re: Planning Commission approval notification;
3 Oct 96	Public Works comments; standard;
12 Oct 96	Notice of Public Hearing for City Council meeting of 22 Oct 96;
22 Oct 96	Letter of Opposition from Clean Air Transport Systems – re: neg. dec. doesn't address air quality well enough;
22 Oct 96	Staff Report to Council: recommended to approve project;
22 Oct 96	City Council meeting: project discussed, zoning request approved, EIA approved with a Mitigated Negative Declaration; Precise Plan approval P-82-1 was found in conformance with the General Plan; Council waived reading of Ordinance No. 2202;
29 Oct 96	City Council meeting: second reading of the project waived and the project is approved; Ordinance No. 1812 amends the Preliminary and Precise site plans of the project approved in the 1980s; Mitigated Negative Declaration certified;
30 Oct 96	Notice of Determination certifying Mitigated Negative Declaration filed with County Clerk;
16 Jan 97	Building Permit application submitted for all buildings;
19 Aug 97	Building Permits issued for all buildings; fees of \$3,870,078.45 paid for full project = approx. \$6984.34 per unit; Encroachment Permit fee paid of \$1505.92;
Aug 98	Project still in construction; no building permits finalized yet;

Total Time for Approvals:

Project Approval by City:	26 July 1996 - 29 Oct 1996 = 3 months
Building Permit Approval:	16 Jan 1997 - 18 Aug 1997 = 6.5 months
Building Construction Period:	18 Aug 1997 - Aug 1998 = 12.5 months, continuing

Public Participation / Opposition:

The project received no opposition from neighbors or the public. One letter of opposition was received from an environmental group with regard to air quality and the perceived poor quality of assessment of this issue by the city in the initial study and mitigated negative declaration.

CITY of FRESNO:
Dominion Heights: market-rate apartments

<i>Project Name:</i>	Dominion Heights
<i>Project Location:</i>	1160 Perrin Avenue northwest corner of Perrin Avenue and Liberty Hill Road in northeast Fresno
<i>Developer:</i>	Demmon Family Trust / Partnership 333 Twin Dolphin Drive, Ste. 225, Redwood City California 94065 650 637 1446
<i>Owner:</i>	same
<i>Project Components:</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">-196 units on 11.15 acres = 17.58 du/ac;-project constructed in two phases-25 residential buildings, 10 garage buildings, 1 comm. building-4 residential building configurations<ul style="list-style-type: none">-building type 1: two 3 bdrm units – 1 story-building type 2: four 3 bdrm units – 2 story-building type 3: twelve 1 bdrm units – 2 story-building type 4: four 1 bdrm units & 8 two bdrm units - 2 story-four unit plans<ul style="list-style-type: none">-unit type 1: 1 bdrm / 1 ba @ 730 sf; 68 units-unit type 2: 2 bdrm / 1 ba @ 918 sf; 44 units-unit type 3: 2 bdrm / 2 ba @ 960 sf; 44 units-unit type 4: 3 bdrm / 2 ba @ 1151 sf; 40 units-60 garage parking spaces, 136 Carport spaces, 103 uncovered parking spaces: 299 total parking spaces-two large open space lawn areas-green belt around project site-community building, pool, spa, dry sauna, weight room, jogging and bike path around site, softball team
<i>Project Numbers:</i>	APNs: 401-050-40 & 401-030-25 Conditional Use Permit: C-49-109 Site Plan Review application Environmental Assessment
<i>Project Consultants:</i>	Architecture: Quinn / Bremsetter Architecture Landscape Architecture: Lynn Hays Kyle Landscape Architecture
<i>Project Description:</i>	

This gated apartment community is located in the northeast corner of Fresno approximately 10 miles from the city center. The project site is located in the northwest quadrant of the intersection of Perrin Avenue and Liberty Hill Road. To the west of the project site is vacant land and single family residences; to the east across Liberty Hill Road is an elementary school; to the north are a community lawn, Liberty Hill Road, and other condo and apartment complexes; to the south across Perrin Avenue is vacant land. The topography of the site is flat. The land was vacant prior to this development. The project site is roughly rectangular in shape with a jagged northern boundary. A landscaped setback and greenbelt encircle the property to the outside of a wrought iron fence that was

demanding by the community. A jogging and bike path are located within this greenway and connect to the community park to the north of this project.

Two vehicular access points are located along the southern boundary at Perrin Avenue. Both of these entries are gated. The traffic lanes of the primary project entry are divided by two planted median strips. A single loop road encircles the site with residential buildings, Carports, garages and parking spaces to either side. The parking facilities around this loop road are omnipresent and block the views to most of the residential units. At the center of this loop road near the primary entry point are the office and recreation complex, along with a large community lawn that has been landscaped with berms and slight hillocks. The pool and spa are located immediately to the north of the office and are fenced off from the lawn area that surrounds it.

Although there are sidewalks at Perrin Avenue and Liberty Hill Road, there are no sidewalks at the loop road within the project. Concrete walkways connect the residential buildings to the immediate parking areas and garbage enclosures, but do not connect all of the buildings to each other. Interstitial spaces between the buildings and parking areas are heavily landscaped with lawn and trees.

The residential buildings are mostly 2 story walkups with exterior stairs. They are all identical in color and style. They are designed in a spare, contemporary suburban style. They are finished in horizontal grey wood siding, asphalt roof shingles, metal sliding and muntin windows, wood window and door trim, painted wood fascias, and low-pitched gable end roofs. The office and garages are similar in design and color to the residential buildings. The Carports are flat austere structures designed to disappear from view.

These apartments are targeted at pre-home buyers, recent graduates, recently divorced families, those in transition between jobs and housing situations, and singles in roommate situations. The tenants tend to be young. There are a number of children residing in the complex.

Planning and Development Issues:

The project site falls under the jurisdiction of the Dominion Community Plan. A rezone of the project site was granted in 1991 to upzone the property from medium density to high density residential use. The only official approvals that were required were a Conditional Use Permit and a Site Plan Review—along with the perfunctory Environmental Assessment.

Environmental analysis for the project was covered by an Initial Study completed by the Planning Division. A Mitigated Negative Declaration was recommended, with few potential impacts noted, save for moderate impacts to water availability and use, schools, sewers, and traffic. The location of an elementary school across the street from the project site was made an issue by the school district, local Home Owners Associations and concerned members of the public. This resulted in the removal of vehicle access points from Liberty Hill Road.

The project was constructed in two phases, although all of the building permits were pulled at the same time. The first construction phase included most of the buildings to the south, including the office and recreation complex. The second phase completed the project to the north.

Key Project Adjustments:

The Planning Division distributed the project widely for agency comment at various points during the entitlements process. An extensive and detailed set of conditions for the project was produced and adopted from these agency comments.

Opposition from the public and nearby Home Owners Associations raised a number of design related concerns. Most of these concerns resulted in changes to the project. These are detailed in the specific letters of opposition and Planning Commission / Park Fort Washington Home Owners Association agreements detailed below. The most significant of these changes include: vehicle access point changes, building and site changes, fencing of the

California Department of Housing and Community Development

property with a wrought iron fence, tree planting, and parking issues. Concerns by the public over the fencing of the project resulted in the creation of a gated community, rather than the open and un-gated plan submitted by the developer.

This project required the payment of an exceedingly large number of fees and charges levied by various agencies. These assessments are listed under the conditions of approval (detailed on 6 Jan 95 below).

Through the approvals process, no change in the unit count was noted.

Approval Chronology: (important approval dates in bold)

15 Jan 91	Title Report by Central Title Co;
5 June 91	Staff Report to Planning Commission: previous 268 unit condo project appeal of Mitigated Negative Declaration mitigations by the developer; staff recommends denial of appeal; developer refuses to construct a sound wall around the project with a 20' Landscape setback from the property boundaries; several applications and approvals associated with this previous project, including: CUP 91-13, EA T-4298, TT 4298, UGM 423, and RZ 91-05; Commission denies the appeal; developer puts the project on permanent hold;
23 July 91	City Council meeting: rezone for property approved to high density residential (R-3), subject to development of the site; Conditional Use Permit C-91-13;
4 Nov 94	application for project submitted;
4 Nov 94	Development Department fee check list with fees of \$7064 paid;
4 Nov 94	applicant letter to Planning Division – re: letter of agency for Architect to act on behalf of applicant;
19 Nov 94	Solid Waste Division environmental assessment comments: trash enclosures required;
21 Nov 94	Clovis Unified School District environmental assessment comments: \$1.72 per sf required; additional impact fees required to offset costs of student transport to intermediate and high schools;
22 Nov 94	San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District environmental assessment comments: mitigations and site changes recommended to conserve air quality; no wood burning fire places allowed; use of natural gas recommended; exterior electrical outlets required to promote the use of electrical Landscape maintenance equipment rather than gas-driven motors;
22 Nov 94	Health Services environmental assessment comments: none;
24 Nov 94	Fire Department environmental assessment comments: standard comments;
late Nov 94	Building Permit application submitted for pre-mastering of building plans;
28 Nov 94	Planning Division environmental assessment comments: insufficient information to complete assessment;
28 Nov 94	Woodward Park Home Owners Association environmental assessment comments: density too high, school impacts, not in conformance with community plan, minimum density should be approved for this
28 Nov 94	Community Planning environmental assessment comments: project acceptable; Mitigated Negative Declaration recommended;
28 Nov 94	Fire Department environmental assessment comments: none;
28 Nov 94	Building Division environmental assessment comments: none;
28 Nov 94	Public Utilities Administration environmental assessment comments: sewer Capacity suffices;
28 Nov 94	Police Department environmental assessment comments: none;
28 Nov 94	Public Works Department - Traffic Division environmental assessment comments: none;
28 Nov 94	Public Works Department - Development Services Division environmental assessment comments: only minor increases in traffic anticipated;
28 Nov 94	Department of Transportation letter to Development Department – re: regional impact fees recommended to be levied;
8 Dec 94	Architectural Committee meeting: plans discussed with city officials present;

Multi-family Projects

California Department of Housing and Community Development

16 Dec 94 Dominion Home Owners Association environmental assessment comments: access points across from elementary school to the east should be moved; fence should be erected around the project; more garage parking should be constructed; unit count should be reduced; detailing at rear of buildings is minimal and should be increased;

3 Jan 95 Department of Public Utilities letter to Development Department – re: will-not-serve letter; water services are not currently available to the site; sewer services are available however;

4 Jan 95 Building Permit plan check completed;

6 Jan 95 Conditions of Approval prepared; conditions listed by agency: Public Works conditions include: street improvements, street lights, fees detailed, lateral sewer charges, oversized sewer charges, major facilities sewer charges, wastewater facilities sewer charges, and trunk sewer charges; Water Department conditions include: transmission grid main provision, street frontage utilities provision, fire hydrant charges, water supply and well charges, wellhead treatment fees, recharge fees, service charges, and meter charges; Urban Growth Management conditions include: UGM Permit fees, fire station fees, neighborhood park fees, major street charges, major street and bridge charges, traffic signal charges, at grade RR crossing charges, and Millbrook overlay sewer service charges; Planning Division conditions include: consistency with Woodward Park Community Plan and development standards, undergrounding of utilities, visual screening of meters and utility boxes, 490 mid-sized trees to be planted on site, and 50% shading of parking areas; 20 miscellaneous agency conditions include: school fees, street trees, submittal of a color board, and archaeological / paleontological provisions;

6 Jan 95 Initial Study for Environmental Assessment; no Significant impacts noted; moderate impacts to water availability and use, schools, sewers, and traffic;

6 Jan 95 Development Department letter to applicant – re: notification of appeal procedures for utility service denial;

9 Jan 95 Planning Division letter to applicant – re: notification of Mitigated Negative Declaration recommendation;

9 Jan 95 Staff Report to Development Department Director: minimal findings supplied for special permit;

9 Jan 95 Development Department Director approves special permit;

13 Jan 95 Notice of Public Hearing to discuss Mitigated Negative Declaration;

13 Jan 95 Public notification of Mitigated Negative Declaration for project; public review period begins;

17 Jan 95 Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District comments: notice of requirement for conditional use permit forwarded, along with request for \$33,318 fee;

17 Jan 95 Drainage fee revised to \$33,907;

20 Jan 95 Water Analysis;

20 Jan 95 Will-serve letter for water and sewer provision forwarded; based on revised water use and site plan revisions;

23 Jan 95 Dominion Home Owners Association letter to Development Department – re: group is opposed to annexation of this project into their Home Owners Association;

28 Jan 95 Appeal period ends for Mitigated Negative Declaration;

2 Feb 95 Mitigated Negative Declaration review period closes and all comments are due;

13 Feb 95 Site plan revision to allow two access points from Perrin Avenue rather than those on Liberty Hill Road to lessen traffic impacts on school site to east;

15 Feb 95 Notice of Public Comment of Development Department Director's decision;

16 Feb 95 Development Department letter to applicant – re: notification of Development Department Director's approval of special permit;

20 Feb 95 Letter of Opposition from Jim O'Neal – re: parking and fence issues; construction material selection is weak and will produce an inferior product; apartment frontages should be oriented towards street;

24 Feb 95 Letter of Opposition from Patty Roche re: request for wrought iron fence around project; no parking areas requested for adjacent streets; requested complete rejection of the project and multi-family uses on this site; request for stop signs and sidewalks;

California Department of Housing and Community Development

24 Feb 95	Letter of Opposition from Champlain Heights Home Owners Association re: concern with through path to future park on the north side of the project; safety issues; fencing and improved pedestrian circulation plans requested;
25 Feb 95	Letter of Opposition from Woodward Park Home Owners Association re: traffic safety issues at Liberty Hill Elementary School; request to widen Liberty Hill Road with a median island;
28 Feb 95	Letter of Opposition from Brandon Knolls Home Owners Association re: request for project fence and more adequate parking;
28 Feb 95	Letter of Opposition from Dan O'Brien re: site configuration and school safety problems; requested no parking zones on Liberty Hill Road across from school;
1 Mar 95	Letter of Opposition from Richard and Julie Shupe re: same requests as those of Patty Roche;
2 Mar 95	Letter of Opposition from Augusto Loaiza MD re: project will result in decreased property values for the single family homeowners in the area due to the cheap construction of this apartment complex;
2 Mar 95	Letter of Opposition from David C. Kalemkanian re: fence around project site; request to increase the percentage of full garages on the site and parking in general; concerns over the size, style and color of buildings; he suggests the buildings look like army barracks with little relief in detailing;
3 Mar 95	Notice of Public Hearing for Planning Commission meeting of 15 Mar 95;
7 Mar 95	Clovis Unified School District comments: requests fence around project;
9 Mar 95	Park Fort Washington Home Owners Association letter to applicant re: requirement for 5' wrought iron fence around project with 300 signatures on petition;
10 Mar 95	applicant letter to Park Fort Washington Home Owners Association re: responses to concerns;
11 Mar 95	Letter of Opposition from Park Fort Washington Home Owners Association – re: request for removal of the vehicular access point at Liberty Hill Road; parking is inadequate; sidewalks should be constructed at street edges; a Landscape screen between the single family residences should be erected; finished floor elevations should be lower than the single family residences; the site plan should be modified to create a meandering visual experience; tree screening of the buildings, parking areas, fence and parkway areas should be installed; materials should better match adjacent projects; the quality of the overall design is poor;
15 Mar 95	Staff Report to Planning Commission: recommended project approval and certification of the Mitigated Negative Declaration;
15 Mar 95	Planning Commission meeting: continued to next meeting of 19 Apr 95;
31 Mar 95	Park Fort Washington Home Owners Association letter to Development Department re: request for authorization to speak on behalf of the neighborhood;
6 Apr 95	Letter of Opposition from Park Fort Washington Home Owners Association re: fences, parking, landscaping and building design issues;
6 Apr 95	Dominion Home Owners Association Architectural Committee meeting: project discussed; early Apr 95 Meetings between Park Fort Washington Home Owners Association, Architects, and Staff to iron out issues;
17 Apr 95	Agreement letter from Park Fort Washington Home Owners Association re: similar concerns as those presented in letter of 11 Mar 95 are agreed with the developer;
19 Apr 95	Planning Commission meeting: project approved and Mitigated Negative Declaration certified; requires applicant comply with Park Fort Washington Home Owners Association letters dated 11 Mar 95 and 17 Apr 95; applicant agrees to construction of 5' wrought iron fence around the project site, building design changes to increase detailing and windows, and increased tree planting;
24 Apr 95	Development Department letter to applicant – re: notification of Planning Commission approval;
3 May 95	Revised site plan submitted;
12 June 95	City Forester letter to Development Department – re: 23 street trees required around project perimeter;
26 July 95	Revised site plan submitted;
8 Aug 95	Building Permits issued for full project;
9 Aug 95	Drainage fees paid in full;

California Department of Housing and Community Development

11 Aug 95	Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District letter to Development Department – re: request to withhold occupancy permits due to drainage fee obligations that remain unmet;
20 Oct 95	\$589 in additional Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District fees;
5 Jan 96	\$157.50 in additional fees required for CUP amendment and revised CUP application;
10 Jan 96	Revised exhibits submitted;
6 May 96	Withhold of occupancy released;
23 Sept 96	Building Permits finalized; project completed.

Total Time for Approvals:

Project Approval by City:	4 Nov 1994 - 19 Apr 1995 = 5.5 months
Building Permit Approvals:	late Nov 1994 - 4 Jan 1995 = 1.25 months
Building Construction Period:	8 Aug 1995 - 23 Sept 1996 = 13 months

Public Participation / Opposition:

The project received Significant opposition from both individual members of the public and various home owners associations from the immediate area surrounding the project site. While some letters of opposition questioned the presence of a multi-family project on this site, most others were concerned with the design and site layout of the project. Several letters requested the removal of vehicular access points across from an elementary school. Others requested the fencing of the property, building design, siting of the buildings, parking adequacy, tree planting and other issues. Meetings between the developer and one of the Home Owners Associations resulted in an agreement for provision of nearly all of the Home Owners Associations requests. The Planning Commission incorporated these agreements into the project approvals. Although these neighborhood groups are not part of the formal entitlements process, they were successful in utilizing their voluntary involvement to impact the resultant conditions of approval.

CITY of LOS ANGELES:
Vista Angelina: affordable apartments

Project Name:	Vista Angelina Apartment previously known as Temple - Edgeware Apartments
Project Location:	on the south side of West Temple Street between Bixel and Edgeware just west of the 110 and downtown LA
Developer:	Nieman / Related Partners 663 W. Fifth Street, 38 th Floor, Los Angeles California 90071-2007 213 891 8407 Temple - Edgeware Boys and Girls Club
Owner:	Nieman / Related Partners 663 W. Fifth Street, 38 th Floor, Los Angeles California 90071-2007 213 891 8407 Temple - Edgeware Partners LP (initial project owners) 1230 Rosecrans Avenue Ste. 4015, Manhattan Beach California 90266 Temple - Edgeware 118 Partners LP
Project Components:	-108 total units on 1.7 acres = 63.53 units per acre -single 3 and 4 story building -units at various levels of median income (AMI.) affordability -10 one bdrm units @ 575 sf: 2 @ 35% AMI/ 8 @ 50% AMI -65 two bdrm units @ 855 sf: 13 @ 35% AMI/ 52 @ 50% AMI -17 three bdrm units @ 1165 sf: 3 @ 35% AMI/ 14 @ 50% AMI -15 four bdrm units @ 1250 sf: 3 @ 35% AMI/ 12 @ 50% AMI -1 two bdrm manager unit @ 936 sf -two levels of parking garage with 138 internal parking spaces -project includes: community meeting rooms, educational programming, job training programs, a tot lot, Boys and Girls Club, and laundry facilities
Project Numbers:	94-0340
Project Consultants:	Architecture: The Birba Group / Peter Kamnitzer Management Company: Related Management Co. Attorneys: Latham & Watkins / Riordan & McKenzie

Project Description:

This affordable apartment project located in the Central City West area was funded almost completely from City of Los Angeles and HUD coffers. The project is 100% affordable. It is located in a low-income Hispanic neighborhood south of the 101 and west of downtown and the Harbor Freeway. To the south of the project site are single and multi-family residences; to the north across West Temple Street are hotel and retail properties; to the

California Department of Housing and Community Development

east are commercial and residential parcels across Bixel Street; to the west are school and retail uses across East Edgeware Road. Bixel and Edgeware are parallel to each other, while West Temple cuts across them at an angle heading into downtown Los Angeles.

The project is a five story building on a site that slopes downwards from the southwest to the northeast, with two levels of parking and three levels of residences. The first two stories of the project have been partially sunken into the slope, rising to a four and a half story elevation at the corner of Temple and Bixel—three and a half stories at the south end of the property at Edgeware road. The first level of parking is accessed via Bixel Street; the second level via Edgeware Road. An elevator near the Bixel Street entrance leads to a podium upon which all of the residential units have been constructed. The parking levels are constructed of CMU and concrete, and with Type V wood construction at the residential levels.

The “L” shaped residential site plan shows the housing units fully ringing the perimeter of the property, creating two courtyards at the center. The courtyards are separated by architectural forms set at angles to the bulk of surrounding units. Three elemental volumes have been placed parallel to the angle of West Temple Street to create volumetric contrast within the courtyards. The exterior of the building has been horizontally divided by the parking level below and the residential units above. The parking level is finished in stucco with square glass block and fenced openings. The residential units contrast materially and volumetrically with the parking levels. They have been articulated with many pop-outs and roof volumes. Multi-story bay window elements are located at all of the street elevations. A large octagonal tower feature with a much taller mansard roof is positioned at the corner of West Temple and Edgeware Streets. Along the southern part of the building on Edgeware, the building has been dissembled even further into smaller residential volumes, giving the impression of single family dwellings, to contextually harmonize with the existing urban fabric and the single family residences adjacent to the project. The building is designed in an updated Victorian-style with wood siding, square muntin windows, and a shingled mansard-style roof. Decorative gable-end brackets are located at the top of all the bay windows and in dormer elements at the roof line. A shallow landscaped edge surrounds the building at all street edges. The color scheme is defined by dark and pale greens, terra-cottas, deep tans, and greys.

Planning and Development Issues:

The project location falls under jurisdiction of the Central City West Specific Plan. The project proposal fully complied with the specific plan and current zoning designations. No rezoning was required for the project. because of this full compliance, the project only required Advisory Agency and City Council approval. The developer was asked to redesign the project and reduce the number of units from 124 to 108 early in the entitlements process. The Housing Development Division wanted the project to fully comply with development standards as outlined in the specific plan and zoning ordinance, to avoid Planning Commission approval for any variances that might have been required. The project thus required no Planning Commission review.

The Housing Development Division can administratively approve projects of four units or less, but must receive City Council approval and environmental certification on all larger projects. Local Council District Office approval is sought on all Housing Development Division projects prior to internal Loan Committee approval within the Division. The Division seeks to ensure that any public opposition to the projects is smoothed over before proceeding with any City Council requests.

The project required assembly of 5 parcels to produce the “L” shaped lot. The site is located on land gently sloping down to the northeast.

Grading and partial excavation was required to prepare the semi-subterranean first level of parking.

The developer was entitled to pre-determined fees for development of the project. As per the Conditions of Approval, \$10,000 per unit and \$260,000 in deferred fees were required to be split 2/3 - 1/3 between the developer

California Department of Housing and Community Development

and the Boys and Girls Club. because of these pre-determined fees, risk on the project was minimized for the developer.

Subsequent to project completion, several tenant complaints with regard to project security were submitted to the Housing Development Division. The Police Department responded with comments and suggestions, and these were forwarded to the project developer and manager.

Key Project Adjustments:

Per project file documentation at the Housing Development Division, there were virtually no comments received from relevant service providers. Changes to the design and the number of units were requested by the Housing Development Division prior to project approval. The initial proposal for the project had 124 units of various sizes. This was reduced at the request of the city to 100 units. Later in the project, the unit count was increased to 108 units; these were eventually constructed.

A 6' CMU sound wall was required at the rear of the development to separate it from the single family dwellings to the south.

Various development and impact assessment fees were collected on the project: \$82,000 for building permit plan check; \$180,000 for schools; \$175,000 for sewerage; \$54,000 for dwelling unit taxes; \$50,000 for mechanical permits and plan check; and other smaller fees.

Approval Chronology: (important approval dates in bold)

18 Dec 89	Project proposed and Requests for Proposals published;
21 Jan 93	Escrow Closing Statement for land acquisition by applicant;
15 Mar 93	application Submitted to Los Angeles Housing Department;
29 Mar 93	Los Angeles Housing Department letter to applicant re: request for additional information;
9 Apr 93	Los Angeles Housing Department memo re: many design problems with project;
13 Apr 93	Los Angeles Housing Department letter to applicant re: notification of incomplete application; issues detailed to bring application to complete status;
22 Apr 93	Land purchase and acquisition agreement between the City and applicant prepared;
30 Apr 93	applicant letter to Los Angeles Housing Department re: commitment to request Low Income Housing Tax Credits partnership in project;
5 May 93	Los Angeles Housing Department Loan Committee Meeting: Department not willing to go through with the project at this time until size and design problems are solved and application is deemed complete; no decision on loan yet;
5 May 93	Los Angeles Housing Department letter to applicant – re: notification of Loan Committee decision and discussion of concerns over the project size and design;
11 July 93	Project reduced to 100 residential units for unknown reasons: 8 one bdrms, 57 two bdrms, 16 three bdrms, 18 four bdrms, and managers unit.
12 July 93	California Tax Credit allocation Committee Project Staff Report;
15 July 93	Meeting between applicant and Los Angeles Housing Department to discuss project;
26 July 93	applicant letter to Los Angeles Housing Department re: notification that the project has been reduced from 124 units to 100 units;
11 Aug 93	Federal Tax Credits received in the amount of \$1.6 million;
16 Aug 93	applicant letter to Los Angeles Housing Department re: project update; Community Council strongly supports the project;
14 July 93	Site Identification Form;
20 Oct 93	Preliminary Site Assessment;
26 Oct 93	applicant letter to Los Angeles Housing Department re: acquisition costs of project @ \$3.5 million for Neiman / Related to purchase assets from Temple - Edgware partners;

Multi-family Projects

California Department of Housing and Community Development

4 Nov 93	applicant letter to Los Angeles Housing Department re: updated expense statement for project; \$836,000 spent thus far on project preparation, demolitions, fees, and various consultant costs;
5 Nov 93	applicant letter to Los Angeles Housing Department – re: land acquisition and appraisal @ \$3.4 million;
8 Nov 93	Advisory Agency -- Los Angeles Housing Department Loan Committee meeting: project approved; with several conditions of approval, including: developer to pay 15% of purchase price for land, developer must bring in a non-profit partner, the non-profit partner shall receive 1/3 of the developer's fee, an environmental mitigating and phase II report shall come from the developer's fee, the developer shall have the property appraised, and a school impact appraisal report shall be undertaken;
18 Nov 93	Appraisal report submitted by Stringer Appraisals;
24 Nov 93	Los Angeles Housing Department Memo – re: project schedule;
29 Nov 93	Initial Study for Environmental Assessment check list completed by city;
29 Nov 93	De Minimus Impact Finding and Certificate of Fee Exemption from California Department of Fish and Game;
30 Nov 93	Mitigated Negative Declaration prepared for project: potentially Significant impacts noted, include: flooding, air pollution, tree loss, noise, illumination, marginal fire protection, water supply, and landscaping;
3 Dec 93	Report from City Administrative Office – re: request for land acquisition loan of \$2.14 million;
6 Dec 93	Housing and Community Redevelopment Committee Meeting;
9 Dec 93	Project site appraisal review by Los Angeles Housing Department;
10 Dec 93	City Council approves \$1.99 million loan to applicant for land acquisition;
20 Dec 93	Updated Title Report;
13 Jan 94	Agreement between applicant and City to purchase property signed;
18 Jan 94	Notice of Determination prepared;
18 Jan 94	applicant letter to Los Angeles Housing Department – re: closure of oil wells bid estimate @ \$15,000 - \$25,000 per well;
18 Feb 94	Rent Schedule with unit distribution submitted;
28 Feb 94	application submitted with loan request of \$6.75 million from Los Angeles Housing Division; project costs estimated at \$15 million; \$136.11 per sf; \$140,074 per unit;
22 Mar 94	Boys and Girls Club selected as the required non-profit organization to join the joint venture partnership to qualify for affordable housing funding;
24 May 94	Los Angeles Housing Department response to Request for Proposal with revised loan numbers;
21 June 94	Temple - Edgeware Boys and Girls Club LP incorporated;
27 June 94	Request for approval of a pre-development / construction loan, and a permanent loan to developer; project back at 108 units;
18 July 94	Financing Report from City Administrative Office – re: predevelopment and construction loans to Housing and Community Redevelopment Committee;
22 July 94	City Council meeting: project approved and certification of mitigated neg. dec.; predevelopment and construction loans approved;
late July 94	Building Permit application; Reference No. 94 LA 24938;
3 Aug 94	Title Report and Title Insurance;
15 Aug 94	Non-construction Affirmative Action Plan and a Minority / Women Owned Business Enterprise Agreement reached by the City and applicant;
17 Aug 94	Amended & Restated Agreement of Limited Partnership for Temple - Edgeware 118 Partners LP;
19 Aug 94	Restated articles of incorporation;
29 Aug 94	Loan application Check List sent to applicant;
9 Sept 94	City Council approves project documents; assignment and assumption agreement signed; promissory note for \$6.33 million signed by city and applicant;
26 Sept 94	Building Permit Issued:
26 Sept 94	Memo to Contractor – re: notice to proceed with construction;
5 Dec 95	Certificate of Occupancy issued: construction and project complete;
undated	HUD Project Completion Report;

California Department of Housing and Community Development

5 Mar 96	Reaffirmation of subordination agreement attached to mediation agreement between applicant and Union Bank;
14 Mar 96	Amendment to Subordination Agreement C 87641, modification of promissory note and extension of loan period;
4 June 96	Subordination Agreement signed between City, Temple - Edgware Boys and Girls Club and Temple - Edgware Partners LP; Agreement No. C 87641;
21 Nov 96	Resident complaints about project security submitted to Los Angeles Housing Department;
6 Dec 96	Los Angeles Housing Department letter to applicant – re: security issues raised by residents;
18 Dec 96	Request for Police Department review of project due to complaints from residents;
30 Dec 96	Council District Monthly Status Report;
8 Jan 97	Los Angeles Housing Department letter to applicant – re: security issues raised by residents;
8 Jan 97	Police Department comments to Boys and Girls Club -- extensive crime prevention and safety comments included respective of: site lighting, security fencing, locks, landscaping, avoid sky lights, solid doors, fire exits, bolted down equipment, avoid windows at street level—use glass block instead, metal screening on rubbish enclosures, parking area security;
24 Nov 97	Los Angeles Housing Department letter to applicant – re: many resident complaints submitted about project;

Total Time for Approvals:

Approval by City:	15 Mar 1993 - 22 July 1994 = 16 months
Building Permit Approval:	late July 1994 - 26 Sept 1994 = 2 months
Building Construction Period:	26 Sept 1994 - 5 Dec 1995 = 16.25 months

Public Participation / Opposition:

Little opposition from individuals or community groups was noted in project files with Housing Development Division. Strong support from the Community Council was indicated in letters from the applicant to the Housing Development Division. By nature of the public involvement with this project, support from the city was ensured throughout the development process once the design was approved internally by the Housing Development Division Loan Committee.

ORANGE COUNTY:
Skyview: market-rate apartments

<i>Project Name:</i>	Skyview Apartment Homes
<i>Project Location:</i>	Northeast quadrant of Los Alisos Blvd and the Foothill Transportation Corridor toll road central area of Rancho Trabuco Community in Rancho Santa Margarita, northeast of Mission Viejo
<i>Developer:</i>	Sares - Regis Group 18802 Bardeen Avenue, Irvine California 92715-1521 714 756 5959
<i>Owner:</i>	Rancho Santa Margarita Company 30211 Avenida de las Banderas Rancho Santa Margarita California 92688 714 589 4040
<i>Project Components:</i>	-260 units on 21.01 acres = 12.37 units per acre -four building types in various unit configurations -Type 1: 16 units per building; 4 of this bldg type -Type 2: 16 units per building; 7 of this bldg type -Type 3: 8 units per building; 3 of this bldg type -Type 4: 12 units per building; 5 of this bldg type -six unit plans -plan A: 1 bdrm executive, 1 ba, @ 600 sf ea; 28 units -plan B: 1 bdrm studio, 1 ba, @ 739 sf ea; 52 units -plan C: 1 bdrm + den, 1 ba, @ 918 sf ea; 28 units -plan D: 2 bdrm studio, 2 ba, @ 917 sf ea; 72 units -plan E: 2 bdrm dual, 2 ba, @ 999 sf ea; 56 units -plan F: 3 bdrm, 2 ba, @ 1218 sf ea; 24 units -544 total parking spaces: 260 garage, 88 Carport, 196 uncovered -recreation center / clubhouse @ 3500 sf with mgmt / admin offices, community kitchen, lounge, fireplace, fitness center, residential business center, conference room, TV media room, swimming pool, spa and laundry facilities
<i>Project Numbers:</i>	APNs: 836-031-56 and 836-151-10 Planning application: PA 96-0156 (Rezone of Feature Plan) Planning application: PA 97-0035 (Site Development Permit) Environmental Assessment Permit
<i>Project Consultants:</i>	Civil Engineering: Fuscoe Engineering Architecture: KTGy Group, Inc. Landscape Architecture: Arthur D. Guy III Associates

Project Description:

This multi-family apartment complex is located on hillside land to the northeast of Mission Viejo. The project site slopes down from the northeast, with the lowest point in the southwest corner. The project site is a triangular “shark-fin” shaped parcel bordered on the north and west by Los Alisos Boulevard. Across the boulevard to the west is the O’Neill Regional Park, and to the north are medium density single family residential uses. To the east are more existing single family residential uses, and to the south is the Foothill Transportation Corridor toll road. The project site is just east of Mission Viejo on the edge of the county jurisdiction. The parcel on which the project is located is the westernmost parcel of the Rancho Trabuco North Community.

Significant grading was required to create two flat construction pads where the project has been sited. Eight of the residential buildings are located on the higher, northern pad; and the other eleven residential buildings and the recreation center are located on the lower, southern pad. A large graded slope separates the two pads, which are connected by a narrow service road on the eastern edge of the parcel. The recreation center is located in the northwest corner of the southern pad, and is relatively inaccessible for residents of the northern housing cluster. A single vehicular access point is located off Los Alisos Boulevard to each residential pad.

Vehicular access to the northern residential cluster is from the west at the center of the pad. The northern pad has a single loop road which accesses all of the parking and residential areas. Residential buildings are located to the center, the south, west, and north of this road. Garages are located to the east, with Carports and uncovered parking scattered along the length of the road in front of and between the buildings. A large open lawn is located at the center of the loop road with three residential buildings surrounding it.

Vehicular access to the southern pad is from the northwest corner, below the large slope of the northern pad. The southern pad again has a single loop road, but this time, there are two short dead-end parallel spurs to the northwest and southwest of the loop to access additional parking areas. This creates two clusters of housing: one to the west of the loop road between the spurs (which contains three residential buildings and the recreation complex—adjacent to the entrance), and at the center of the loop (which contains eight residential buildings and two lawn areas). Garages and Carports are located at the perimeter of the loop road on this lower pad and along the spurs.

The garages form the perimeter wall for much of the project to the south and east, with shorter 5’ masonry sound walls constructed between them to fence off the project site. A huge slope and landscaped setback is located at the eastern edge of the property. Large landscaped slopes where the pads were created faces Los Alisos Boulevard. At the main vehicular entry to the southern pad is located a 17’ high terraced entry monument supporting the name of the development.

The project is a gated community in a contemporary “Monterey” - California / Mediterranean architectural motif. The buildings are finished with stucco plaster, concrete Spanish roof tiles, wood trellises and trim, knee braces at the gable ends, wood fascias, slat wood handrails at balconies and patios, metal sash windows, louvered doors, built-up plaster arches and details, and colorful accent awnings. The residential buildings are formed from various configurations of stacked flats with shared Staircases. Each unit has a balcony or patio area. Although the buildings are virtually the same across the site, they are highly articulated, detailed and volumetrically interesting.

Planning and Development Issues:

The project site falls under the jurisdiction of the Rancho Trabuco North Community Plan and Design Criteria. An area and dwelling unit transfer within the community (feature) plan and a zone change was required for the project to proceed. The parcel was originally zoned for commercial use under the feature plan, and required a zone change to residential use. At the time of application the site was vacant.

Environmental Assessment for the project was tiered off the Trabuco North Community Plan EIR that had been certified in 1981. Few environmental issues were raised in the Initial Study. The project site is located in an area

California Department of Housing and Community Development

prone to wild-fires and mandated a fuel modification plan. Parkland Dedication was covered under previous arrangements agreed between the developer and the county with regard to the overall community plan.

No special circumstances or deviations from existing development standards were being sought. Although Planning Commission approval was required for the rezone, no Planning Commission approval was required for the development itself, allowing Zoning Administrator review of the project.

Key Project Adjustments:

Comments from relevant service providers and agencies were generally of a standard nature, and tended to require few additional project requirements, outside of fees. Additional project site reporting was mandated on a variety of environmental topics. Various impact and assessment district fees were required by a variety of agencies. Fees and assessment district impacts were wide ranging, and included: Capistrano Unified School District fees, Sheriff Substation Facility Fees, Santa Margarita Water District fees, three different Thoroughfare and Bridge fee assessments due to the location of the project, and an additional encroachment permit with requisite fees. Few Physical additions were made to the project through agency comment, save for sidewalk, vehicular turnaround, access point configuration changes, and the addition of sound walls between the perimeter garages.

No change in the unit count was noted in the project file through the course of the entitlements process.

Approval Chronology: (important approval dates in bold)

1981	Rancho Trabuco Community Plan adopted for 1260 acre development that will include: 3756 dwelling units, an elementary school, public parks, and open space at build out;
14 Oct 81	EIR No. 274 for Rancho Trabuco Community Plan certified;
1 Mar 89	Amendment to Rancho Trabuco Community Plan reducing the number of dwelling units to 3728; changes to planning areas 2, 3 and 4;
6 Jan 97	Initial Study by the Orange County Environmental Management Agency: Mitigated Negative Declaration recommended; project tiered off previous EIR 274; no Significant impacts noted for this project; potential impacts listed along with recommended mitigations, including additional noise studies; Project is exempt from California Department of Fish and Game fees;
28 Jan 97	Planning and Development Services Department Report: rezone approval recommended due to the growth of other commercial centers in Mission Viejo; no opposition received from agencies; transfer of 14.8 acres from Community Plan area 7 to area 10 recommended; several letters of opposition received from the public over the lack of open space / park land development in the area;
28 Jan 97	Planning Commission meeting: approval of rezone for PA 96-0156 , a feature plan amendment for rezoning of the Community Plan from commercial to residential;
5 Mar 97	Rancho Santa Margarita Co. letter to Current Planning Services – re: notification to county of joint venture association with Sares-Regis Group;
6 Mar 97	Applications submitted for project: with deposit of \$4000 for land use and environmental analysis approvals;
11 Mar 97	Project routed to agencies for comment; due back by 8 Apr 97;
17 Mar 97	Acoustics comments: standard conditions submitted;
18 Mar 97	County Property Permits comments: Encroachment Permit required for landscaping and road tie-in improvements;
21 Mar 97	NPDEC comments: community Car wash area required;
27 Mar 97	Fire Safety comments: standard conditions;
27 Mar 97	Grading Division comments: minor standard comments
1 Apr 97	Drainage Division comments: drainage study required + standard comments;

California Department of Housing and Community Development

8 Apr 97 Traffic Engineering comments: conditions submitted along with Traffic and Bridge Fee requirements for both the Foothill Circulation Precise Plan and the Foothill Eastern Transportation Corridor; 2 inbound lanes required at both access points from Los Alisos Blvd;

10 Apr 97 Noise Analysis for Rancho Trabuco North by Mestre Greve Associates; requires 5' sound walls between Carports and garages;

22 Apr 97 Rancho Santa Margarita Civic Council Planning Advisory Committee comments: opposed to zone change from commercial to multi-family residential; would prefer that the project go before the Planning Commission rather than the Zoning Administrator; opposed to gated aspect of the project;

20 May 97 Title Report by First America Title Insurance Co;

21 May 97 Meeting between Architect and Traffic Engineering Division to review and discuss proposed project conditions;

22 May 97 applicant letter to County – re: submittals for residential public notice mailing;

22 May 97 Meeting between Landscape Architect and Fire Safety Authority to discuss fuel modification conditions;

22 May 97 Letter of support from neighbor Chris Harris, suggesting the style of the project is in accord with the community plan, and that views would not be blocked;

23 May 97 Notice of Public Hearing posted at site;

27 May 97 Chris Harris letter forwarded to County by applicant;

28 May 97 Fuel Modification Plan submitted by Landscape Architect to Fire Safety Authority;

29 May 97 Architect memo to applicant – re: reduce sidewalks at entry to one side only; turnaround at the recreation center; entry lane discussed;

30 May 97 Notice of Public Hearing for 12 June 97 Zoning Administrator Hearing;

9 June 97 Letter of opposition from neighbor Jeffrey L. Morita – re: request to deny project based on expected decreased housing values due to the approval of a multi-family project in the neighborhood; this type of project reduces the standards within the neighborhood to which permanent residents aspire to maintain; opposed to rezoning of the property from commercial to multi-family residential; such short notice of the afternoon public hearing will not accommodate his schedule—and thus he will not be able to attend;

11 June 97 Letter of opposition from neighbor Nancy Dea re: opposes high sound wall and reduction of setback to 10' from the 20' requirement;

12 June 97 Rancho Trabuco Civic Council Planning Advisory Committee letter to the Zoning Administrator – re: project needs further revision to text of feature plan; cumulative multi-family units exceed the 966 allowed in the feature plan;

12 June 97 Planning and Development Services Department Report: request for modification of county development standards, including: increased heights of sound walls and Carports, reduced setbacks at Carports, and reduced setbacks to living areas; No prohibition against gated communities exists within the Rancho Trabuco Development Guidelines; 43 conditions of approval outlined, including: aircraft noise notification; NPDES requirements; additional drainage, fuel modification, grading, and drainage studies and plans; sidewalks required at both sides of entry gate; sprinklers required throughout buildings; landscaping and irrigation required across site;

12 June 97 Zoning Administrator hearing: project approved despite considerable opposition from residents of the area; 7 letters of opposition presented on topics including: noise increases, lack of parkland development, destruction of views, rezoning of the commercial land use designation, vegetation selections by Landscape architect, public safety concerns, and facilities impacts; 9 findings included with respect to CEQA, land use and General Plan consistency;

8 July 97 Water Quality Management Plan submitted by Engineer;

14 July 97 Building Permit application submitted;

23 July 97 Water Quality Management Plan reviewed by NPDES coordinator;

3 Nov 97 Street Section comments: Landscape plan acceptable;

20 Nov 97 Building Permits issued;

California Department of Housing and Community Development

6 May 98	Applicant letter to Planning Department – re: revisions to site plan and submittal of new application;
7 May 98	Application submitted for changes to site plan to add storage lockers to detached garages; CP 98-0039; \$190 fee paid;
2 June 98	Memo to file – re: new application and site plan revisions;
3 June 98	Changes to site plan approved by staff at Current Planning Services;
Aug 98	Project in construction.

Total Time for Approvals:

Project Approval by County:	6 Mar 1997 - 12 June 1997 = 3.25 months
Building Permit Approval for models:	14 July 1997 -20 Nov 1997 = 4.25 months

Public Participation / Opposition:

significant opposition to this project was registered by several members from the neighborhood where the project site is located. Issues of opposition were wide ranging: from decreased home values, to issues with the rezone, destruction of views, and adequate public facilities and services. Although some members of the public requested that the Planning Commission review the project, the Zoning Administrator was the final authority with purview over the proposal. The Planning Commission never reviewed the project, except for the rezone.

CITY of REDDING:
Willow Park: market-rate apartments

<i>Project Name:</i>	Willow Park Apartments
<i>Project Location:</i>	591 Hilltop Drive in north central Redding
<i>Developer:</i>	Patsy and Gary Knighten Co. PO Box 994505 900 Market Street, Redding California 96001 530 244 2029
<i>Owner:</i>	Same
<i>Project Components:</i>	-48 total units on 5.31 acres = 9.04 units per acre -12 buildings each with 4 units (4-plexes) -all two story townhouses -all 2 bdrm / 1.5 ba -2 unit sizes: \pm 1000 sf and \pm 1120 sf -each unit has a one Car garage & a reserved uncovered space -common laundry rm, storage rm, office, and swimming pool
<i>Project Numbers:</i>	APN: 17-150-05 Use Permit: UP 9-96
<i>Project Consultants:</i>	Civil Engineering: Whitson Engineering, Inc. Architecture: Judson Engineering Environmental Consultant: North State Resources

Project Description:

The market rate apartment / townhouse project is located on slightly sloping land in north central Redding: to the west are single family residences; to the east are apartments and Sandpoint Drive; to the north is multi-family housing; to the south is Hilltop Drive and park / greenway space. The site slopes down from both the northern boundary and the southern boundary from Hilltop Drive. A meandering access road enters the property from Sandpoint Drive near the southeast corner of the property and heads diagonally across the parcel to the northwest before curving back to Sandpoint Drive along the northern boundary. A landscaped median island divides the main vehicular entry. A natural drainage swale with riparian vegetation cuts across the property from east to west cutting off 1/3 of the buildable land area to the north from the southern 2/3s. Four of the buildings are located on this northern 1/3 of the property. The 8 other buildings are located on the southern piece. A culvert was constructed under the road at the swale to permit natural drainage from landscaped areas. The rest of the property drains to the access road that deposits runoff in the existing city stormwater system along Hilltop Drive.

Spur roads off the main access road lead to the parking areas and buildings which are positioned parallel to the slope throughout the development. Uncovered parking areas are scattered across the site in small bays between the buildings rather than in long parking rows. A screened RV parking area is located along Hilltop Drive west of the swimming pool in the southeast corner of the property just south of the main vehicular entrance. A proposed laundry room is located in this pool area. The office is attached to one of the units towards the center of the development. Plentiful landscaped open space exists between the buildings, roads and parking areas. The site was

covered in indigenous blue oaks and manzanita many of which required demolition to allow construction, however many were saved which accounts for the large open spaces.

The buildings are rectangular bar-buildings dominated by garages that stick out on the front elevations. Between the garages are lattice-work fenced patios that lead to the unit entrances. Fenced patios have also been positioned at the rear of each unit. The lattice work fences are trimmed in oversized wood and have decorative wood spheres at each unit entrance. There are two unit sizes. The larger units are located at the ends of the rowhouse style fourplexes and have chimneys at shorter gable end elements that step down from the long, 2 story, single ridge-line buildings. The buildings are detailed and finished on all sides. The buildings are clad in horizontal wood siding, have wood rake fascias and deep eaves, and are roofed in asphalt composition shingles. The white, aluminum frame windows with muntins are trimmed all around with 1 x 3 wood, with the sills trimmed in 1 x 12. Inoperable shutters are situated on most of the sliding windows on all sides of the building. Decorative half-round windows and attic vents are located at the gable ends of the building and at the garages.

Planning and Development Issues:

The project only required a use permit from the Board of Administrative Review since the project complied with existing zoning. Since no rezone or conditional use permit was required, the project did not need a Planning Commission approval.

A previous use agreement with this owner involved a density transfer from an adjacent property and placed a limit on the number of units allowed on this parcel. This agreement was finally discarded after much discussion in favor of current allowable densities. Current zoning allowed 56 units on the site, easily allowing the project's proposed 48 units.

The project required a USACE wetlands delineation that eventually identified .6 acres of jurisdictional waters along the swale and riparian corridor. The project had no intention of grading the wetland, and in fact enlarged it by preserving the riparian corridor. Drainage from hardscapes was diverted away from the swale to the city's stormwater system.

The site was covered in native blue oak and manzanita. The city required oak trees of a certain size to be saved, and required the developer to make all attempts to save and replace all demolished trees. A very large 24" diameter oak tree at the north end of the property that was required to be preserved was eventually demolished due to disease and a hollow trunk. The city required extensive tree replacement on the site.

Key Project Adjustments:

A few city agencies required additions to the project. Road improvements to Hilltop and Sandpoint Drives were required by the Public Works Department. The Planning Department required project fencing and the northern boundary and at Hilltop Drive. Extended environmental permits and delineations were required by the Board of Administrative Review due to the presence of a small wetlands area. An extensive tree program was also mandated. Although a separate meandering bike path through the site was requested by the Community Projects Manager, this was not included in the conditions of approval.

California Department of Housing and Community Development

Approval Chronology: (important approval dates in bold)

Mar 80	Barton Archaeological Review by Shasta College Cultural Resources Center – cultural resources located on adjacent lot to the north;
17 Feb 87	Development Agreement signed by city and previous owner for project that did not materialize;
6 Feb 96	Architect's drawings dated;
29 Feb 96	Engineer's drawings dated;
1 Mar 96	Use Permit application submitted with \$900 fee;
6 Mar 96	Request for residential mailing list;
7 Mar 96	Use agreement drawn up – re: lot densities within the area;
15 Mar 96	Initial Study Environmental Review checklist completed by Planning Department – no Significant impacts noted; Mitigated Negative Declaration recommended; project requires wetlands delineation by USACE; developer to save 23 of 74 oak trees at the project site and replace those that are demolished;
15 Mar 96	Traffic Analysis Study;
15 Mar 96	Engineer's drawings revised;
20 Mar 96	Fire Department comments – standard;
20 Mar 96	Phone conversation between Planning Department and applicant – re: environmental requirements;
20 Mar 96	Board of Administrative Review meeting: approved project; wetlands permitting process required; tree loss to be minimized; minimal findings noted—re: General Plan, land use, land form, and code consistency; project carried by unanimous vote; Mitigated Negative Declaration announced at this meeting—to be discussed at next meeting;
21 Mar 96	Public Notice of Negative Declaration for Board of Administrative Review meeting of 10 Apr 96;
28 Mar 96	Engineer's drawings revised;
1 Apr 96	Community Projects Manager's comments – requirement for 6' wide meandering bike path through the site;
9 Apr 96	Fire Department comments – standard;
10 Apr 96	Board of Administrative Review meeting: adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration and 36 conditions of approval for project, including: replacement of lost trees; requirement for 102 new trees planted on site; developer to receive a 2 tree credit for every one saved; parking lot locations altered for tree preservation; 48 units claimed to exceed allowable units for the site per the previous land use agreement;
12 Apr 96	Notice of Determination filed with County of Shasta;
12 Apr 96	Asst. City Attorney letter to Planning Department – re: density transfers;
12 Apr 96	Use Permit granted with 36 conditions of approval;
21 Apr 96	Use Permit effective;
23 Apr 96	USACE letter with delineation of .6 acres of jurisdictional wetlands;
29 Apr 96	Asst. City Attorney letter to Planning Department – re: lack of affordable housing units within the project per granting of code incentives;
7 May 96	Note to permit file – re: City Attorney invalidation of previous use agreement; as per current zoning, site allows 56 units – proposal's 48 units are within scope of current density allowances;
30 May 96	USACE wetlands delineation letter;
31 May 96	North State Resources letter to Engineer – re: wetlands permit from USACE;
5 June 96	Environmental filing fee of \$1275 paid;
20 June 96	North State Resources letter to Engineer – re: no pre-discharge notification required; no Landscape features located at the site that could be used for endangered species habitats;
26 June 96	Note to permit file – re: changes to conditions of approval vis-a-vis tree removal and preservation;
27 June 96	Building Permit application filed; followed by other building permits for common buildings and swimming pool at later dates;
17 July 96	Engineer's drawings revised;

California Department of Housing and Community Development

26 July 96 Development Services Department letter to applicant – re: Public Works approval of improvement plan; \$1900 fee required for improvement plan check and inspections;
15 Aug 96 Engineer's drawings revised;
20 Aug 96 Note to permit file re: 24" diameter oak on site to be removed due to disease & hollow trunk;
5 Sept 96 Building Department fax to applicant re: several conditions are required to have been met prior to building plan check;
15 Oct 96 First Building Permit issued for project; (other than street improvements permit, which was issued earlier);
26 Mar 97 First Certificate of Occupancy issued;
5 Aug 97 Planning Department & Public Works approve final occupancy on all units except unit 12;
21 Aug 97 Final Certificates of Occupancy issued for project; project and construction complete.

Total Time for Approvals:

Project Approval by City:	1 Mar 1996 - 21 Apr 1996 = 1.75 months
Building Permit Approval:	17 June 1996 - 15 Oct 1996 = 4 months
Building Construction Period:	15 Oct 1996 - 21 Aug 1997 = 10.25 months

Public Participation / Opposition:

No public opposition to the project by any neighborhood groups or individuals was noted in the project file.

REDWOOD CITY:
Bair Island: market-rate apartments

<i>Project Name:</i>	Bair Island Apartments and Marina
<i>Project Location:</i>	700 Bair Island Road in the Redwood Shores area of northeast Redwood City east of US 101
<i>Developer:</i>	Irvine Apartment Communities 591 Redwood Highway, Ste. 5275, Mill Valley California 94941 415 381 3001
<i>Owner:</i>	Rials Development 1601 Response Road, Ste. 350, Sacramento California 95815 916 641 5796
<i>Project Components:</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">-155 units on 12.7 acres = 12.2 units per acre-8 residential buildings and 1 recreation center building-4 buildings over parking podium, 5 buildings at grade-five unit types with average unit size of 1049 sf<ul style="list-style-type: none">-plan A: 1 bdrm; 49 units-plan B: 2 bdrm flat; 62 units-plan C: 2 bdrm townhouse; 10 units-plan D: 2 bdrm flat with den; 24 units-plan E: 2 bdrm townhouse with den; 10 units (city may view these as three bedroom units)-315 total parking spaces: 90 podium garage, 55 tuck-under, 25 Carport, and 145 uncovered on grade (includes marina parking)-recreation center / community building @ 3500 sf with swimming pool, spa, fitness center, community rooms, kitchen, management office, rental center and laundry facilities-190 standard boat slips, 15 live aboard slips, and marina facilities-2 town squares, boardwalks, and seating areas
<i>Project Numbers:</i>	APN: 052-540-030 Planned Development Permit: PD 10309-7 Land Use Permit: L10711-7 Environmental Assessment: EA 10903-7 Preliminary Design Review: PDR 10600-7 Tentative Parcel Map
<i>Project Consultants:</i>	Architecture: Backen, Arrigoni and Ross

Project Description:

This multi-family, market-rate complex and marina are located in a flat wetlands area in eastern Redwood City, just east of US 101 and were designed for high-income tenants. The parcel is a long, east-west, irregular rectangle, with the east side wider than the west. The project site is bounded by two marinas; to the south is the Peninsula Marina, to the north is Pete's Harbor, Smith Slough and Bair Island. To the west is vacant land across Bair Island Road; to the East is Redwood Creek and access to the bay.

A marina has been dredged out of the center of the parcel, opening up to Redwood Creek at the southeast corner of the site. The marina is lined with steel sheet pile retaining walls that support the land where the buildings are constructed. The buildable land area that remains is a thin ribbon that fully encircles the marina to the west and north, and partially surrounds it to the northeast and southwest. The ribbon of land is contiguous with adjacent parcels except along the eastern boundary where a peninsula is formed. Extending southwards from the northeast, this peninsula of land separates the marina from Redwood Creek. The residential areas are located to the north, east and west; marina access and visitor parking are located to the southwest.

Bair Island Road accesses the property at the southwest corner and skirts the property at the western boundary to access Pete's Harbor to the north. Carports and a residential access road are located at the perimeter of the residential land area, with a turnaround at the midpoint of the peninsula to the east. Carports line the property boundary along the west and north edges. This residential access road is gated at the southwest corner of the property. A shorter public access road and entry court from this same vehicular access point leads to the visitor parking area and marina along the southern boundary.

The recreation center, offices, swimming pool, spa and gardens are located at the marina's west edge at the entry court to the southwest. Residential buildings surround the recreation center to the west and north and extend all the way around the marina to the peninsula on the east. All of the residential buildings are oriented towards the marina with excellent views. Thin strips of landscaping and walkways separate the buildings from each other and provide a minor buffer to the boardwalk at the marina edge. This boardwalk encircles the edge of the marina with seating areas scattered along its length. The turnaround at the peninsula and areas around the recreation center serve as public open space for the residents. The boat slips are accessed from the marina parking area to the south, and from the recreation center to the west. A primary floating walkway connects these two access points and extends towards Redwood Creek to the east. All of the slips branch perpendicularly to the north from this primary east-west floating walkway.

The buildings themselves are designed in a contemporary Italian fishing village architectural motif. The buildings are finished with stucco plaster, concrete Spanish roof tiles, knee braces at the gable ends and eaves, wood fascias, metal handrails at balconies and stairs, aluminum sash windows, built-up plaster details, French doors, and window boxes. The building facades are highly articulated on all sides of the buildings, with many projecting and recessed building elements. The roof line is varied with many dormers, and combination roof types. At the recreation center, a bell tower has been located to provide a symbolic entry element for the project. Although the buildings are virtually the same floor plan across the site, the exteriors are modulated to diminish this repetition. The exterior is painted in a rich Mediterranean color scheme that creates diversity and change between similar building elements from building to building.

Planning and Development Issues:

The project required standard approvals: tentative map, land use, and planned development permits along with an environmental assessment. The developer requested a reduction in the parking space requirements for the project, but was denied this request. The project site is located in the 100 year flood plain and required building elevation mitigations.

The project site had already been rezoned through a 1990 General Plan Amendment in anticipation of a similar project by the same developer that never proceeded. The site had also been previously graded and dredged to accommodate construction of the marina, except for a dam of land that simply needed opening to permit water intrusion into the marina area. Permits for dredging the marina, along with required environmental mitigations and reports were already in hand, prior to the submittal of applications for this project. USACE permits for creation of the marina were initially recorded in 1986. California Department of Fish and Game fees had also already been paid.

California Department of Housing and Community Development

Although much of the environmental analysis had already been completed, an initial study was still completed for this current project. The project received a mitigated negative declaration that allowed it to proceed with minor mitigation measures.

The location of the site beneath the PG&E towers and electro-magnetic field along US 101 created some concern for the city. PG&E produced enough documentation and evidence to suggest that no harmful effects on future residents would be caused by the presence of the overhead power lines.

Key Project Adjustments:

At the preliminary review period, comments from city agencies were intense and critical of the project. The Architectural Advisory Committee, the Planning Department and the Plan Review Committee recommended sweeping changes and substantial redesign of the project. When the formal application for the project was submitted, comments from relevant service providers and agencies were minimal, and added only a few project requirements in addition to fees. Additional project site reporting was mandated on a variety of topics, including soils, pollution prevention, parking, traffic, biological and cultural resources. Various impact and assessment district fees were required by a variety of agencies. These included: various traffic mitigation fees, corridor assessment fees, citywide traffic impact fees, school fees, and fair share contributions to the construction of a bridge over Redwood Creek to provide a secondary means of access. Only the physical additions were made to the project through agency comment (after preliminary review), except for the addition of the following: a tot lot, increased planting and Landscape screening of parking areas, parking lot adjustments, and the requirement for a 24 hour on-site project manager.

A change in the unit count was evidenced from the earlier 1990's proposal of 117 units, to the current proposal at 155 units. No change in the unit count was noted in the project file through the course of the entitlements process once the formal application was submitted.

Approval Chronology: (important approval dates in bold)

20 Aug 86	USACE permit recorded to allow dredging of the marina area; USACE initially delineated the site as a degraded wetlands with minimal impacts and losses expected with its conversion to a marina; wetlands mitigations put in place to minimize impacts to habitats and currents; permit extended to 25 Mar 1999;
pre-1990	Project site is zoned for General Commercial uses within the General Plan;
22 Jan 90	General Plan Amendment approved to change land use designation to mixed use General Commercial and Residential;
1991	USACE wetlands mitigations completed;
18 Feb 92	Mitigated Negative Declaration certified for a similar project at this site by Rials Development; project includes 117 condominium units and a 92 slip marina;
3 Mar 92	Tentative Map and Planned Development Permit approved by Planning Commission; project does not proceed due to market conditions;
late 1996	Rials Development joins with Irvine Apartment Communities to develop the current project proposal;
15 Jan 97	applicant and Planning Department discuss project planning and development issues;
12 Mar 97	Project Data Sheet submitted by applicant;
17 Mar 97	Planning Commission meeting: technical addendum to Negative Declaration certified;
3 Apr 97	Preliminary Design Review application submitted; optional, voluntary review not required by city; \$150 filing fee paid;
8 Apr 97	Architectural Advisory Committee and Plan Review Committee Meeting: many comments delivered to applicant; no parking allowed along street at project perimeter; open space needs to be of better quality; building designs are too austere and need to be more varied; more amenities need to be offered, including visitor parking areas, boardwalks, benches, and

Multi-family Projects

California Department of Housing and Community Development

viewing areas; site plan should be revised to orient all buildings to the marina, rather than to the undeveloped land to the north or the parking lots; traffic study recommended with regard to a second means of access and egress; applicant should contribute to fair share construction of bridge over Redwood Creek; number of 3 bdrm units should be increased; aesthetics and design needs to be more varied; landscaping and open space is insufficient;

14 Apr 97 Planning Department letter to applicant – re: forwarding of official comments from meeting on 4 April;

30 May 97 Architect letter to Planning Department re: submittals and questions;

4 June 97 Parking Survey prepared by Barton and Aschman Associates;

17 June 97 Applications submitted; \$1500 fee paid;

18 June 97 Initial Study Form completed and faxed to the Planning Department by the applicant;

20 June 97 Fire Department comments: standard;

24 June 97 Architectural Advisory Committee and Plan Review Committee meeting: liked changes to site plan and architecture; a few changes are still required, including: Landscape screening at parking areas; town square needs definition, bollards, and additional planting; open space is still limited; parking needs to be increased for marina and visitors; traffic study required;

27 June 97 Request for Proposal forwarded to Fehr & Peers Associates from the Planning Department for preparation of a Traffic, Circulation and Parking study;

Aug 97 Initial design drawings for project dated by Architect;

25 Aug 97 Geotechnical Report and letter to applicant;

11 Sept 97 Site plan submittals by Architect;

16 Sept 97 Site plans revised and resubmitted by Architect;

16 Sept 97 Landscape Concept Plan submitted to Planning Department;

23 Sept 97 Preliminary Plan Review Committee comments: Bair Island Road improvements required;

30 Sept 97 Planning Commission Study Session: reviewed Bair Island Road improvement issues for the agenda of the next meeting;

1 Oct 97 Cultural Resources Study and Archaeological Report by Adam Siro and the Anthropological Studies Center at Sonoma State University; no cultural resources identified at the site;

3 Oct 97 Planning Commission submission of exhibits by Architect;

7 Oct 97 Environmental Assessment checklist completed by Planning Department;

7 Oct 97 Planning Commission meeting: project discussed & continued to next meeting on 21 Oct 97;

8 Oct 97 Public review period begins for Mitigated Negative Declaration documents;

8 Oct 97 Notice of Public Hearing for review of Mitigated Negative Declaration by Planning Commission on 21 Oct;

21 Oct 97 Planning Commission meeting: traffic and access issues discussed & continued to next meeting on 4 Nov 97;

22 Oct 97 Letter of Opposition to the project received by the Planning Department re: concerns with traffic generation, PG&E lines; wants the number of residential units decreased; opposed to gates on the project; wants public access ensured; children's amenities are lacking; views of the parking area are too exposed;

22 Oct 97 Notice of Public Hearing for Planning Commission meeting of 4 Nov 97;

30 Oct 97 Initial Study for Environmental Assessment prepared by the Planning Department; several Significant and potential impacts noted, including: irreparable change to soils, siltation, drainage, absorption rates, changes in water currents, plant biology and habitats, introduction of new species to area, noise, light and glare, population increases, and traffic hazards; Mitigated Negative Declaration recommended;

30 Oct 97 Traffic Study prepared by Fehr & Peers Associates;

30 Oct 97 Engineering and Construction Department comments: soils report required; additions to the conditions of approval submitted;

31 Oct 97 PG&E comments; Electro-magnetic fields discussed;

3 Nov 97 PG&E comments: although discussed in previous meetings, no adverse impacts have been evidenced from electro-magnetic fields caused by overhead power lines; company sends along reports and information packet in support of evidence to the applicant;

California Department of Housing and Community Development

4 Nov 97 Staff Report to Planning Commission: recommends approval of project and certification of Mitigated Negative Declaration; conditions of approval included in staff report;

4 Nov 97 Planning Commission meeting: project approved and Mitigated Negative Declaration certified; tot lot added since last meeting; conditions of approval issued, including: creation of a pollution prevention plan, various other permits and approvals required, additional traffic study analysis required, various fees detailed, 24 hour property manager required on site to monitor residential project and marina; Secondary road access funding and location discussed; Gated nature of the project remains an issue, although pedestrian and boardwalk access by the public has been assured by the developer. Although many members of the public voiced approval of the project, 10 speakers voiced opposition to the gated parking lot.

5 Nov 97 Mitigation measures forwarded to applicant by Planning Department;

7 Nov 97 Planning Department letter to applicant – re: notification of Planning Commission approvals;

18 Nov 97 Planning Department letter to applicant – re: Traffic Impact Fee Agreement is required;

13 Jan 98 Planning Department letter to applicant – re: traffic and access issues; Fehr and Associates have been asked to submit proposals evaluating 2 alternative access roadway options;

6 Apr 98 Initiation of eminent domain proceedings against the Peninsula Open Space Trust for construction of Bair Island Road and Bridge; staff report on the issue prepared;

17 Apr 98 Planning Commission Meeting: private access road to the project site along the north edge of Bair Island is to become public; environmental assessment and Mitigated Negative Declaration is approved and certified for access road;

13 July 98 City Council scheduled to approve final map;

Total Time for Approvals:

Project Approval by City: 17 June 1997 - 4 Nov 1997 = 4.75 months

Public Participation / Opposition:

Moderate opposition and support to this project was registered by several members of the public. Most people reviewing the proposal liked the big-picture concept of the apartments and marina—and the associated development benefits of this project to the eastern part of the city. No concerted group opposition to the project was noted, however, a number of people voiced opposition to the gated aspect of the project. Although the Planning Commission eventually allowed the gated parking lot, the developer was required to allow public access to the marina and boardwalk areas.

CITY of SACRAMENTO:
Bruceville: market-rate apartments

Project Name: Bruceville Apartments

Project Location: East side of Bruceville Road, North of Shasta Avenue
in North Laguna Creek area of south Sacramento
just west of Highway 99 and east of Cosumnes River College

Developer: Majority Investments, Inc.
then at 257 N. Amphlett Boulevard, San Mateo California 94401
Lane Borges: Developer's Agent 916 782 7200

Owner: Majority Investments Inc. / Albion Enterprises

Project Components:

- 96 units on 9.48 acres = 10.13 units / acre
- 9 residential buildings total
- 3 residential buildings with 8 units each
- 6 residential buildings with 12 units each
- three unit types
 - Unit 1: 1 bdrm / 1 ba @ 679 sf ea
 - Unit 2: 2 bdrm / 1 ba @ 821 sf ea
 - Unit 3: 2 bdrm / 2 ba @ 887 sf ea
- all buildings two stories
- all second story units have balconies
- 96 Carport parking spaces; 66 uncovered parking spaces
- 1600 sf clubhouse and swimming pool

Project Numbers: APNs:117-182-018, -019, -020, -021, -022, -023 & part of -001
Plan Review: P88-115 and P95-038
Rezone

Project Consultants: Civil Engineering: A. R. Associates
Architecture: Eatough & Borges Architects - Planners

Project Description:

This unconstructed project was initiated by a Hong Kong based company, Albion Enterprises and its subsidiary Majority Investments Inc. It was intended to be a gated multi-family apartment complex, located in the North Laguna Creek area of south Sacramento. The site was rectangular along the east west axis, with a large square shaped parcel removed from the northwest corner. Located to the west of the project site was Cosumnes River College; to the east were vacant county lands and Highway 99; to the north was vacant city land; to the south were residential uses and more vacant county land.

The ten buildings of this development were to be clustered together with a loop road surrounding a large central cluster of 5 buildings, including the clubhouse and pool. The other residential buildings were located at the perimeter of the property to the south and west. A single vehicular entrance was located in the southwest corner of the site at Bruceville Road. A second emergency only entrance was located at the northwest corner along the same road. Two of the residential buildings separated these two entrances from each other. Traffic was separated at the main entrance by gates and a landscaped median. A meandering loop road surrounded the central cluster and accessed all of the buildings. Parking areas were located at the perimeter of the loop road, either in Carports or

California Department of Housing and Community Development

uncovered parking spaces. Trash enclosures were located periodically at the perimeter amongst the parking spaces. Views to several of the buildings were obscured by Carports that were positioned in front of them.

The clubhouse and swimming pool were located at the center of the site near the main vehicular entrance. The clubhouse was to contain an entry lounge, community room, manager's office, laundry room, kitchen and restrooms. A swimming pool and open lawn area were to be located to the east and north of the clubhouse, respectively. The site was to be heavily landscaped with trees, lawn areas, and pathways that connected the units to each other and to the clubhouse.

The nine residential buildings were designed in an austere contemporary suburban style. The buildings were to have either 8 or 12 units in each of them. The exteriors were to be finished with stucco, concrete roof tiles, and horizontal aluminum sliding windows. The gable roofed buildings had little detailing, except for some stucco horizontal banding, window trim, balconies and open stair cases with wrought iron hand rails. Each of the units had either a balcony or an enclosed ground floor patio. All of the units had some form of exterior storage cabinet. The Carports were designed to match the color scheme of the apartments and included tile roofing. The buildings were planned to be painted pale terracotta with teal trim.

The project was proctored through the Plan Check process by the architect, and the plans received Building Department approval. No permits were ever issued for the project however, since the developer abandoned the project in the spring of 1996. The developer was unable to find acceptable financing for the project that was economically feasible. When the project was abandoned, developer disbanded operations and liquidated the staff.

Planning and Development Issues:

The development of the site required minimal approvals and permits. In the late 1980s a rezone of 62.8 acres, including this project site, was undertaken. Both the Planning Commission and City Council took part in this zone change process as a result of land annexation to the city.

The current project only required a Plan Review by the Planning Commission since it was consistent with the requirements of that previous zone change and the General Plan. No City Council approval was required for the project. Prior to development in 1995 the site was flat with no substantial vegetation. The project site is not located in any flood plain zone.

The need for emergency access and egress required a secondary emergency access entrance to the northwest of the site from Bruceville Road.

Key Project Adjustments:

Comments from relevant service providers and agencies were standard. Just a few physical changes were made to the project in the process of collecting these comments, including: required landscaping with fast growing trees and undulating berms, a wrought iron / concrete pillar fence at the north, south and east property lines, 24 hour security monitoring of the laundry room, on-site surveillance systems for the project management staff, 24 hour on-site staff management, stucco finishes and concrete tile roofing on all buildings and Carports, and a graffiti abatement program.

Fees for the project were standard. Planning fees were determined on an hourly basis in addition to standard permit fees. Additional stormwater and drainage permits would have been required by the State during construction.

The applicant and school district entered into an independent project impact mitigation agreement. No land Dedication to the school district was made.

Multi-family Projects

California Department of Housing and Community Development

As part of the conditions of approval, the owner was required to enter into a “good neighbor policy” with the North Laguna Creek Neighborhood Association, and join the Sacramento Valley Apartment Association.

No change in the unit count was noted in the project file through the course of the approvals process.

Approval Chronology: (important approval dates in bold)

5 Jan 87	City Manager letter to City Council: recommended approval of revised city annexation policy for project site;
16 June 87	Project site annexed to the city within the Danekas Annexation;
9 Dec 87	application submitted for rezone;
7 Mar 88	Project routed to agencies for comment;
11 Mar 88	Negative Declaration prepared by Planning Department;
14 Apr 88	Staff Report to Planning Commission: recommended approval of rezone and certification of Negative Declaration;
14 Apr 88	Planning Commission meeting: approved rezone; forwarded to City Council meeting of 24 May 88 for final approval;
11 May 88	Staff Report to Planning Commission: recommended rezone be passed for publication;
17 May 88	Rezone passed for publication;
18 May 88	Staff Report to City Council: requesting rezone and certification of Negative Declaration;
24 May 88	City Council meeting: Rezone approved through Ordinance No. 88-035;
23 June 88	Rezone becomes effective;
mid-Feb 95	Plan Check completed and approved;
3 Apr 95	Site Feasibility Study for South Sacramento by Market Perspectives;
12 May 95	application filed for Plan Review;
10 May 95	Letter of Agency from owner allowing architect to act as agent on owner’s behalf;
23 May 95	Project routed to agencies for comment; extensive agency list;
26 May 95	Building Inspections comments;
30 May 95	Citywide Planning Department comments;
7 June 95	Department of Utilities comments: standard;
16 June 95	Fire Department comments: requires second access road into project; other standard comments;
23 June 95	Transportation Engineering comments: street Dedication and development standards delineated;
26 June 95	City Tree Services comments;
21 July 95	Planning Department letter to Architect – re: comments and routing of project to various neighborhood associations;
27 July 95	Police Department comments: visibility and security concerns; 24 hour on-site management required, along with restrictive tenant screening;
28 Aug 95	Revised site plan drawings submitted by Architect;
29 Aug 95	applicant fax to Planning Department – re: changes to site plan and house designs completed;
29 Aug 95	Original application revised;
8 Sept 95	North Laguna Creek Neighborhood Association letter to Planning Department – re: concerns with low-income and student tenants; group wants assurances against this type of tenant and against viewable on-site parking from Bruceville Road;
11 Sept 95	Planning Department letter to applicant – re: North Laguna Creek Neighborhood Association meeting notification for 13 Sept 95;
12 Sept 95	Planning Department letter to applicant – re: North Laguna Creek Neighborhood Association comments forwarded;
12 Sept 95	Citywide Planning Department comments; follow up;
12 Sept 95	Environmental Services Division prepares full, un-mitigated negative declaration for Plan Review; no Significant impacts noted; extensive comments and reporting required;
12 Sept 95	Notice of Determination filed; full Negative Declaration;

California Department of Housing and Community Development

13 Sept 95	applicant presents project to North Laguna Creek Neighborhood Association; group demands conditions for project approval, including: security assurances and on-site management; group has concerns over the construction quality and the quality of tenants;
14 Sept 95	Planning Department letter to applicant – re: Environmental documents forwarded;
15 Sept 95	Transportation Engineering comments: follow up;
18 Sept 95	Fire Department comments: same as previous;
5 Oct 95	Department of Utilities comments: follow up;
7 Oct 95	Planning Department letter to applicant – re: Staff Report forwarded along with conditions of approval;
9 Oct 95	Notice of Public Hearing for Planning Commission meeting of 26 Oct 95;
16 Oct 95	Elk Grove Unified School District letter – re: district already impacted and requires higher impact fees than those allowed by statute;
17 Oct 95	Elk Grove Unified School District letter: requesting developer dedicate land for a new school site in the area due to school impacts;
18 Oct 95	Planning Department letter to applicant – re: additional fees required; scheduling of Planning Commission meeting;
19 Oct 95	Fees paid to Planning Department: \$921.48 in hourly staff fees for entitlement preparation; \$2125 for Plan Review; \$100 for Public Works review; and \$1010 for environmental review;
26 Oct 95	Staff Report to Planning Commission; requesting approval of Negative Declaration and plan review; recommended approval of project, but issues still exist—security and quality of construction;
26 Oct 95	Planning Commission meeting: project approved; 31 conditions of approval with 6 advisory notes attached to project;
early Nov 95	Building Permit application submitted;
late Apr 96	Project abandoned by developer; unable to locate financing to make the project financially feasible; no building permits ever issued; project never constructed;

Total Time for Approvals:

Rezone Approval by City:	9 Dec 1987 - 23 June 1988 = 6 months
Project Approval by City:	12 May 1995 - 26 Oct 1995 = 5.25 months
Building Permit Approval:	1 Nov 1995 - mid-Feb 1996 = 3.5 months

Public Participation / Opposition:

The project received substantial opposition from the local neighborhood association. The North Laguna Creek Neighborhood Association was hesitant about allowing a multi-family apartment complex into their area. The group wanted assurances about security, views into the project, project management, and tenant screening. Many of their concerns were seconded by the Police Department.

CITY of SALINAS:
Gabilan Hills: affordable apartments

Project Name:	Gabilan Hills Townhomes
Project Location:	SW corner of Sanborn Road between Freedom Parkway and Paseo Grande in the Williams Ranch planned community in northeast Salinas
Developer/Owner:	Community Housing Improvement Systems and Planning Association Inc. (CHISPA) 600 E. Market Street, Salinas California 93905 408 757 6251
Original Owner:	Flick Inc. PO Box 310, Menlo Park California 94026 415 321 6533
Project Components:	-100 units on 6.7 acres = 14.9 units / acre -affordable housing project in two phases -Phase I: -24 two bdrm units @ 827 sf ea -24 three bdrm units @ 1254 sf ea -24 four bdrm units @ 1423 sf ea -72 covered pkg spaces, 44 uncovered -Phase II: -8 two bdrm units @ 827 sf ea -10 three bdrm units @ 1254 sf ea -10 four bdrm units @ 1423 sf ea -28 covered pkg spaces, 17 uncovered -buildings all two stories -1540 sf single story community building -play areas, basketball courts, tot lots scattered between units
Project Numbers:	APN: 153-102-16 Site Plan Permit: 94-53 Parcel 18 of Tentative Map 93-3
Project Consultants:	Architecture: Paul Davis Partnership, Architects & Planners Salvador F. Muñoz, AIA Architect

Project Description:

This gated project is one parcel of designated multi-family housing in the Williams Ranch Planned Community in northeast Salinas. Williams Ranch is composed of 36 development parcels with a variety of uses, predominantly single-family residential, community facility and commercial uses. Five of the 36 parcels are designated for multi-family development. This Case study is one of two fully affordable projects in the community. The Williams Ranch Precise Plan was approved in early 1993, and the parcels have been optioned off over the years to different developers.

The site is rectilinear in configuration with a single, gated vehicular and pedestrian entrance on Sanborn Road. A sound wall surrounds the project with a meandering sidewalk to the outside of the project on both Sanborn Road and Freedom Parkway. The housing project consists of 100 townhomes to be constructed in two phases. 80 of the

California Department of Housing and Community Development

units are designated for very-low income residents; the other 20 being designated for low income residents. The three and four bedroom units are configured as duplex townhouses and are two stories each. The two bedroom units are stacked flats in two story buildings, four units per building to roughly match the footprint of the larger duplex units. The units are attached to each other to form clusters around Landscape and recreation areas. All of the units have either a patio or balcony with partial fencing around them. There are four housing clusters, which are separated by collective parking areas and Carports. The buildings are connected to each other and parking by concrete paths set into lawn. The community building sits at the center of the project with uncovered visitor parking around it. The buildings are constructed in a contemporary vernacular of inexpensive building materials. The roof is covered in asphalt shingles and the walls are sheathed in various hardboard sidings with smaller areas of stucco plaster. All windows are sliding aluminum stock.

Planning and Development Issues:

No rezone was required for the project, as it had been designated R-H-2.3-PP high density residential – Precise Plan Overlay by the original Williams Ranch Precise Plan. There were few issues of contention in the approval of this project, since it was previously anticipated in the approval of the Williams Ranch Precise Plan.

40% of the population of the city of Salinas is classified as low- or very-low income residents. This project addresses a large unmet need for affordable housing in this farming community.

Key Project Adjustments:

The project originally included a large percentage of senior housing, which were later transferred to another parcel in the Williams Ranch community.

In the process of agency comments a few additions were made to the project, including: a meandering sidewalk, enhanced Carports, redesign of the site plan to further separate the buildings, better landscaping, greater ADA accessibility, and fire sprinklers.

After approval of the project, the developer requested that the project become a gated community for security reasons, and voluntarily requested to construct a sound wall and wrought iron fence around the project. The city agreed to this proposal.

Approval Chronology: (important approval dates in bold)

16 Feb 93	Williams Ranch Planned Community Precise Plan approved by City Council; including the Williams Ranch Affordable Housing Program to satisfy the city's inclusionary housing requirements mandating 12% of new housing for lower income households to obtain a 25% density bonus in accord with the city's density bonus ordinance;
22 July 93	Development Agreement between city and owner signed and approved;
15 Mar 94	application submitted for Site Plan Permit;
29 Mar 94	Public Works Engineer's Report – re: additional comments;
8 Apr 94	Department of Community Development letter to CHISPA – re: notification of incomplete application after initial review and comments on the project, including: greater building separation required; parking layout not convenient for residents; more landscaping required; pre-fabricated metal Carports not acceptable; ADA access to units is required;
16 May 94	Department of Community Development letter to California Tax Credit allocation Committee (TCAC) – re: thank you for comments on project;
6 June 94	Final Map recorded for parcel (not site plan);
14 July 94	Department Community Development letter to CHISPA – re: city agreement to support project through TCAC, providing CDBG funds for predevelopment costs;

Multi-family Projects

California Department of Housing and Community Development

19 July 94	City Council adopted amendment to Williams Ranch Community Precise Plan to redistribute the 200 required affordable housing units to various parcels within the community;
3 Aug 94	CHISPA letter to Department of Community Development – re: changes to project, including: 28 units of senior housing to be replaced with affordable housing; plans revised to include 20' separation between buildings; however developer does not want to change the Carport designs or the landscaping;
9 Aug 94	Routing Slip to agencies – comments due back 16 Aug 94;
12 Aug 94	Building Inspection Division comments — none;
16 Aug 94	Public Works Engineer's Report – needs more information on plans;
27 Aug 94	Recreation & Parks Department design review comments – none;
7 Sept 94	Public Works Engineer's Report – comments on ADA revisions for accessibility;
7 Sept 94	Fire Department comments and conditions—standard comments; sprinklers required;
7 Sept 94	Public Works Engineer's Report – conditions of approval included that detail development fees and building permit information; requirement of 8' wide meandering sidewalk with 4' parking strip along edge of property;
7 Sept 94	Site Plan Permit Approval Date: sound walls not permitted along street frontages;
18 Sept 94	Effective date of Site Plan Permit;
13 Oct 94	Building Permit application Date;
31 Oct 94	CHISPA letter to Department of Community Development – re: request to defer \$222/unit annual fee for the city Affordable Housing Monitoring Program in lieu of TCAC annual affordable housing report;
1 Nov 94	Notice of Assignment from City Attorney – re: transfer of property from Flick, Inc. to CHISPA;
22 Nov 94	Department of Community Development letter to Mr. Peter Au, Vice President of Award Homes – re: response to letter of opposition – project already approved, too late;
2 Dec 94	Planning Division memo to Director – re: change in covenant allowing California Tax Credit Allocation Committee report rather than the city's Affordable Housing Monitoring Program;
1 Jan 95	Department of Community Development memo to City Attorney – re: covenants for Williams Ranch Affordable Housing developments;
24 Jan 95	Public Works Engineer's Report – re: sidewalk width reduced to 5' if meandering or 5'-6" if straight;
25 Jan 95	Revised architectural drawings with 6' high CMU wall and wrought iron fence around street frontages;
25 Jan 95	Department Community Development letter to CHISPA – re: approval of sound wall with security entries;
1 Feb 95	CC&Rs: to assure affordable housing, 30 years participation in City's Affordable Housing Program mandated; project is awarded federal tax credits by the California Tax Credit allocation Committee;
8 Feb 95	Executed CC&Rs sent to CHISPA from Department of Community Development;
9 Feb 95	Building Permit Issued;
22 Sept 95	CHISPA letter to City Manager – re: request for Certificates of Occupancy prior to completion of full project to qualify for earlier tax credits;
28 Sept 95	City Manager memo to Department Community Development & Public Works – re: Certificates of Occupancy must not be granted before the Carport and landscaping are installed;
28 Sept 95	Building Inspection Division – re: request for final inspection from applicant, despite incompleteness of Carports and landscaping; temporary Certificates of Occupancy granted;
29 Sept 95	Performance Bond obtained by developer for completion of Carports and landscaping;
26 Oct 95	CHISPA Resolution No. 95-19 to allow 2 directors to execute necessary documents for project loans and partnerships;
21 Nov 95	Report to City Council from Department of Community Development – re: CHISPA request to subordinate Gabilan Hills affordability requirements and amendment to Affordable Housing Program Guidelines to add limited subordination provisions to ensure project financing protections; council passes Resolution. No. 15716 and 15717 that authorize subordination restrictions for primary lien holders;

California Department of Housing and Community Development

21 Nov 95	Amendment to CC&Rs to assure affordable housing – re: binding agreement upon transfer of the project to a different owner;
6 Mar 96	CHISPA letter to Department Community Development – re: tenant incomes and rental list;
2 May 96	CHISPA letter to Department Community Development – re: subordination agreement;
29 May 96	Applicant's Attorney letter to City Attorney – re: request for re-affirmation of subordination agreements;
31 May 96	City Manager memo to Mayor and City Council – re: request for re-affirmation of Resolution Nos. 15716 and 15717;
4 June 96	Mayor's letter to Home Savings of America – re: amendment to Williams Ranch Precise Plan to be sought allowing change of affordable housing designation in the event of foreclosure;
4 June 96	Staff Report to City Council – re: subordination agreements;
4 June 96	City Council re-affirms Resolutions;
9 July 96	Staff Report to City Council – re: requesting certificate of compliance with development agreement, subsequent to completion of the project;
9 July 96	City Council meeting: certificate of compliance approved. Project Complete

Total Time for Approvals:

Planning Approval by City:	15 Mar 1994 - 7 Sept 1994 = 5.75 months
Building Permit Approval:	13 Oct 1994 - 9 Feb 1995 = 4 months
Building Construction Period:	9 Feb 1995 - 9 July 1996 = 17 months

Public Participation / Opposition:

Little public participation or opposition by individuals or community groups was noted on the project. Only one letter of opposition to the project was submitted, after the project had already been approved.

CITY of SAN DIEGO:
Camino Real: affordable apartments

<i>Project Name</i>	Camino Real Homes
<i>Project Location:</i>	12655 El Camino Real between Del Mar Heights and High Bluff in Carmel Valley in North City West area
<i>Developer:</i>	San Diego Housing Commission 1625 Newton Avenue, San Diego California 92113 619 231 9400
<i>Owner:</i>	same
<i>Project Components:</i>	-45 units on 2.55 acres = 17.65 units per acre -16 buildings along cul-de-sac in 5 building types: -building type A = 4 three bdrm townhouses -building type B = 2 four bdrm townhouses -building type C = 1 three bdrm handicapped accessible flat -building type D = 4 three bdrm + 1 five bdrm townhouses -building type E = 3 three bdrm towns + 1 three bdrm handicapped accessible C flat -units are small and compact: -24 three bdrm / 1.5 ba townhouses @ 987 sf ea. -3 three bdrm / 1.5 ba HC accessible flats @ 924 sf ea. -16 four bdrm / 2 ba townhouses @ 1198 sf ea. -2 five bdrm / 3 ba townhouses @ 1397 sf ea. -laundry building @ 327 sf -82 uncovered perpendicular streetside parking spaces
<i>Project Numbers:</i>	APN: 307-010-12 Job No. / DEP No. / PD No: 90-0856 HUD No: CA16-P063-047
<i>Project Consultants:</i>	Civil Engineering: Arnson - Roth Associates, Inc. Architecture: Rob Wellington Quigley, AIA Landscape Architecture: Scarborough Landscape, Design & Planning

Project Description:

This multi-family affordable housing project is located in northwest San Diego in the Carmel Valley. To the northwest of the project site is open space, and to the southwest is a private school. The project site is in a partially developed neighborhood, with ample open space and native vegetation remaining in the area. The project proposed the removal, however, of 1.2 acres of chaparral, which was replaced with land purchased by the developer and dedicated to the city. The project is situated on a long thin property abutting the El Camino Real to the west. The project is evocative of a bungalow court with a central vehicular access drive with perpendicular parking to either side, flanked the length of the property on both sides by buildings. The access drive ends in a hammer head at the east end that doubles as a basketball court. A mail kiosk is located at the main entrance, with

California Department of Housing and Community Development

trash enclosures and the laundry building positioned between parking bays. Sidewalks connect the buildings to parking and encircle the parking area on the north, south and east sides.

The buildings are positioned in two parallel lines adjacent to the parking. The five building types are intermingled along the north, south and east edges of the property in an attempt to create a village atmosphere. The buildings have a predominant stepped ridge line that runs parallel to their front facades. The buildings are designed in a stripped down contemporary vernacular. They are rhythmically modulated by canted stem walls and subtractive entry elements that provide interest and relief in what otherwise could be viewed as monotonous, indistinct, inexpensive housing. The buildings are wood frame construction, roofed with asphalt shingles, and finished with stucco plaster. Inexpensive metal sliding windows and doors are used throughout the project. The single story laundry room and trash enclosures provide contrast against the buildings which step down the hillside along the access drive.

Planning and Development Issues:

No formal zone change was required for the project, however the land use of the project site changed from institutional use to housing. The project required the demolition of a derelict Baptist church on the site. The land however was largely vacant as the church only took up a small portion of the lot. A demolition permit was required for the project; as well as a Planned District Development Permit.

Since the project was on a slope that fell from the rear of the lot to the street \pm 50', grading was necessary to produce the building pads: 7600 cy cut, and 6900 cy fill.

The project also proposed the loss of 1.2 acres of Southern-Mixed Chaparral and riparian vegetation adjacent to a nearby creek. Through the approvals process, the Planning Department and City Council eventually requested the developer to purchase land to replace the lost chaparral and dedicate it as open space land.

Key Project Adjustments:

No units were lost in the approvals for this project. However, the developer was required to purchase replacement chaparral habitat to compensate for the loss of chaparral on the project site. Few project adjustments or additions were noted from the agencies reviewing the project.

Approval Chronology: (important approval dates in bold)

28 Oct 88	Grant Deed to San Diego Housing Commission;
14 Apr 89	Mitigated Negative Declaration for project: tiered off North City West Community Plan EIR No. 84-0683 certified on 17 Apr 86; with current Public Notice of Finding; environmental assessment with no Significant impacts noted; comments due back 22 May 89;
14 Apr 89	Request for Release of CDBG funds;
1 May 98	City of San Diego request to HUD for release of \$1.85 million;
21 Aug 90	San Diego Housing Commission general certificate with authorized officers list;
29 Aug 90	Development Plan application and Job Order Request 90-0856; fees of \$4650 paid;
17 Sept 90	Planning Department letter to applicant – re: Notice of incomplete application with issues to be addressed;
28 Aug 90	Architectural schematic drawings dated;
19 Sept 90	Public Notice control sheet;
21 Sept 90	Planning Department check list and progress report;
21 Sept 90	City Architect comments—application incomplete;
26 Sept 90	Fire Department comments—none;
30 Nov 90	Engineering comments—conditions of approval submitted;

California Department of Housing and Community Development

20 May 91	Planning Department letter to applicant – re: Notice of incomplete application and Project Assessment Letter with 7 pages of comments on the development from various agencies—many issues pertaining to site development included; general conditions of approval included;
18 June 91	Project Team meeting;
30 Aug 91	applicant letter to Planning Department – re: responses to Project Assessment Letter;
30 Sept 91	Long Range Planning Consistency Review comments—none, consistent with General Plan;
1 Nov 91	Notice of Public Hearing for Planning Commission meeting of 14 Nov 91;
14 Nov 91	Planning Commission meeting: unanimous approval of project; public opposition to project presented by Carmel Valley Community Planning Group (CVCPG);
22 Nov 91	Accessibility easement to adjacent property drawn up; signed 16 Jan 92;
25 Nov 91	Appeal of Planning Commission decision filed by Joseph N. Beecraft and Turner & Williams on behalf of CVCPG;
25 Nov 91	Planning Department memo to City Clerk – re: docket request for City Council meeting;
10 Dec 91	City Clerk memo to Planning Department – re: scheduling of appeal with City Council;
31 Dec 91	Manager's Report No. P-92-08 for City Council meeting of 7 Jan 92; staff report contains 32 conditions of approval; report details CVCPG opposition to project and subsequent appeal Case, which is largely based on the lack of 1 and 2 bdrm units in the scheme, and too heavy emphasis on larger-sized family units; appeal also based on new information that had arisen since the Planning Commission meeting—namely the lack of schools in the area—however no response was received from the school district per Planning Department routing for comments; The developer has agreed to acquire 1.4 acres of Southern-Mixed Chaparral habitat and dedicate it as open space within the city to replace lost habitat at the project site;
3 Jan 92	Letter of permission for off-site grading on adjacent properties, signed by those owners;
7 Jan 92	City Council meeting: denied appeal and approved project through Resolution No. R-27957;
1 May 92	City Council letter to applicant – re: notification of City Council action;
5 May 92	Planned Development Permit granted;
17 Nov 93	Building Permit application date;
25 Mar 94	Building Permit issue date;
25 Oct 95	Building Permit finalized; construction and project complete.

Total Time for Approvals:

Project Approval by City:	29 Aug 1990 - 5 May 1992 = 20.25 months
Building Permit Approval:	17 Nov 1993 - 25 Mar 1994 = 4.25 months
Building Construction period:	25 Mar 1994 - 25 Oct 1995 = 19 months

Public Participation / Opposition:

Public opposition from the Carmel Valley Community Planning Group was voiced at the Planning Commission meeting, and an appeal of the Planning Commission approval was lodged with the City Council who denied the appeal and re-affirmed the project. CVCPG was opposed to the high percentage of large units in the development vis-a-vis the lack of schools in the area, and to the loss of chaparral habitat in the area.

CITY of SAN FRANCISCO:
Bay Towers II: market-rate apartments

Project Name:	Bay Towers (Phase II)
Project Location:	388 Beale Street, San Francisco on Rincon Hill in the south of Market area
Developer:	The Sprincin Company, Inc. Bay Apartment Communities 4340 Stevens Creek Blvd, San Jose California 95129 408 983 1500 Ted Brown 1620 Montgomery Street, Ste 320, San Francisco California 94111 415 986 0101
Owner:	CNS Partners / Sprincin No. II
Project Components:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">-Project in two phases:-Phase I: conversion of the historic Coffin-Reddington Building on the corner of Folsom and Beale Streets from an office/warehouse to 59 units of residential loft-type housing and 12000 sf of commercial use with 21600 sf open space;-Phase I units: avg. size \pm 1190 sf / unit;-Phase II: two 20 story residential towers; (this Case study)-226 units on .92 acres = 276 units per acre-2 residential 15 story towers over a 5 story parking podium-5 levels of parking on split level hill w/ one level subterranean-street level commercial uses along Beale Street-total estimated floor areas:<ul style="list-style-type: none">-residential @ 299,878 sf-commercial @ 2856 sf-storage @ 11,820 sf-open space @ 1 sf / 13 sf of gross floor area-Street Level: commercial uses, parking, storage-Floors 2-4: parking, storage-Plaza Level (fifth floor):<ul style="list-style-type: none">-3 three bdrm units @ approx. 1700 sf ea-1 one bdrm unit @ approx. 900 sf-commercial uses, parking, storage-Floors 6-17 (12 stories per tower – 8 units per floor):<ul style="list-style-type: none">-4 two bdrm units @ approx. 1200 sf ea / floor-4 one bdrm units @ approx. 785 sf ea / floor-Penthouse Floors 18-20 (3 stories per tower):<ul style="list-style-type: none">-2 three bdrm+ units @ approx. 1750 sf ea / floor-2 two bdrm units @ approx. 1200 sf ea / floor-1 one bdrm unit @ approx. 785 sf ea / floor-Total Units: 15 three bdrms, 108 two bdrms, 103 one bdrms;

California Department of Housing and Community Development

Project Numbers:

Zoning: RC-4-150-R
Case No: 97-404C
application No: 9715964S

Project Consultants:

Architecture: Theodore Brown & Partners, Inc.

Project Description:

The project site is located in a transitional area of San Francisco in the south of Market Street area on Rincon Hill near the waterfront and the anchorage to the Bay Bridge. It is surrounded on all sides by similar office and warehouse uses. The project is located on a sloping site -- sloping downwards from west to east towards the water. The site is currently utilized as a surface level parking lot with a large landscaped slope falling down to Beale Street. Beale Street is to the east; Folsom Street to the north; Harrison Street to the south and various buildings and uses to the west. The two phases of this project are distinct and of different natures. Both phases of the project include predominantly residential uses above street level commercial uses. The residential uses in both phases also include 10% set asides within the project for affordable housing.

The first phase of the project on the corner of Beale and Folsom Streets dealt with the conversion of an historic building into commercial and residential units. Initially utilized as a warehouse and office building, the 1937 Coffin-Reddington Building was designed in a restrained art deco Moderne idiom by Fred H. Meyer, the founder of the California College of Arts and Crafts. The local landmarks board required the preservation of the shell of the building and allowed the complete gutting and conversion of the interior spaces and uses. This phase was approved in 1995, and has since been Carried forward to produce 59 units of housing and various commercial and parking areas.

The second phase of this project (this Case study) concerned the new construction of two identical 20 story residential towers just to the southeast of the first phase along Beale Street. Although prior project approvals have occurred over the last decade, the current revision (1997) sought the addition of 25 units over the previously approved 201. The project provides street level commercial uses and parking, 4 additional levels of parking and 15 levels of residential uses in each tower. The towers rest atop a 5 story podium where the parking levels are located that unifies the site and connects the towers. The project is partially buried in the hillside with the Beale Street entrance at grade on the east side of the project, and the plaza level of the fifth floor at grade on the west side of the project. Open space roof top gardens are provided at the plaza level above the final level of parking, in balconies, and at the penthouse levels. The floor plates above the 5th floor are square-shaped with the opposing corners lopped off (where some of the balconies are located) to create hexagonal floor plates. The towers are positioned to provide a welcoming gesture to the central pedestrian entrance to the building and provide a triangular open space at the Plaza Level above Beale Street. The pedestrian entrance is differentiated from the commercial uses by a 5 story gabled element over the main entrance and a material change to a more solid material from the glass storefronts to either side. Above the street level commercial uses, the 4 levels of parking are screened by large circular pre-cast concrete elements that provide a decorative frieze around the entire building.

The towers are designed in a non-descript volumetric modernism. The building elevations present a variety of articulated intersecting volumes in different materials. A pre-Cast concrete frame provides the main visual structure to the towers -- in contrast to more delicate glass and steel elements which are inserted and hanging from it. Elevational interest is provided in the mix of various building materials (concrete panels, steel, and glass) and in the articulation of the balconies that have created, both additively and subtractively. Skewed Frank Ghery-style sculptural elements in a more solid material at the roof level provide sculptural contrast to the deeply articulated but bland towers themselves. These sculptural elements house the upper penthouses, the elevator towers and assorted mechanical equipment. They are topped by two art deco-inspired sculptural finials that support flight-level emergency light warning beacons. There is no emergency helicopter landing pad on either roof.

California Department of Housing and Community Development

Planning and Development Issues:

The project required a rezone from M-1 manufacturing to very high density residential and commercial uses for the first phase. The second phase did not require a rezone. Several revisions were made to the unit count throughout the 10+ years it took to develop this project, to reflect the market and financial needs of the developers because of the slope on the site and the required amount of parking, a large excavation and soil removal was required.

Key Project Adjustments:

Few mandates and changes were wrought by the city in the course of the project.

Approval Chronology: (important approval dates in bold)

26 Mar 87	FEIR 85.58E issued and certified;
18 Aug 87	Revised FEIR adopted and issued;
17 Dec 87	Previous project proposal received Mitigated Negative Declaration with modifications over the years;
7 Jan 88	Planning Commission meeting: approval of previous project per Motion No. 11250 approving conditional use permit for construction of two 22 story towers with 200 units;
15 Dec 89	Property acquired by owner;
6 Feb 90	Environmental Evaluation filed; based on previous project from Motion No. 11250 of 7 Jan 1988, and FEIR 85.58E issued and certified 26 Mar 1987;
7 Mar 90	Coffin-Reddington Building receives preservation / historic status from SF Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board for the shell of the building;
31 Oct 90	application submittal for new project by CNS Partners/Sprincin No. II, Ltd.; for rezone of the Phase I Coffin-Reddington Building from M-1 light industrial to a high-density residential zone designation, and several development standard variances;
13 June 91	FEIR from 1985 analyzed with Memo to File No. 90.081E--no substantial change in EIR anticipated and no Significant impact changes noted;
20 June 91	Staff Report to Planning Commission;
20 June 91	Planning Commission Meeting: project discussed and continued;
11 July 91	Planning Commission Meeting: project discussed and continued;
18 July 91	Planning Commission Meeting: Motion No. 13129 approved a two phase project of 280 total units: Phase I includes the remodeling of the Coffin Reddington Building and the construction of 79 units, 7 of which would be affordable, with no parking in this phase; Phase II includes the construction to two towers of 201 units, of which 20 units would be affordable, and parking for the entire project at 324 spaces. Planning Commission approves the project with extremely extensive findings that include all conditions of approval as findings. Findings include all development standards, zoning, general plan conformance, and variances to allowable development standards--including: greater site coverage, greater FAR, greater height, greater diagonal measurement, greater bulk above 105', exceptions to freight loading requirements; exceptions to dwelling unit exposure requirements; and transfer of parking to Phase II.
9 Jan 95	application submitted for revision to previous project; for conditional use permit changing the number of units and demolition of building on lot 17 at 345 Folsom Street. Proposal reduced one level of parking and added more penthouse units to roofs of towers.
16 Mar 95	Staff Report to Planning Commission;
6 Apr 95	Planning Commission Meeting: Motion No. 13856 modified the two phase project to 270 total units; revision of project under Motion No. 13129 reducing the number of units in Phase I: Phase I now includes the remodel of the building and the construction of 59 units, of which 6 would be affordable, and 93 on-site parking spaces; Phase II now includes the construction of 201 units, of which 20 would be affordable, with 224 parking spaces; 13 pages of findings and 7 pages of Conditions included, similar to previous;

California Department of Housing and Community Development

30 May 97	applicant letter to Zoning Administrator with fee of \$75;
20 June 97	Letter of support for project from neighbor to Zoning Administrator;
23 June 97	FDR Democratic Club for Persons with Disabilities and Seniors letter to Planning Department -- re: they will oppose the project unless full accessibility and affordable housing pricing levels are met;
24 June 97	application Filing Date with fee of \$850 for conditional use permit for approval of an amendment to Phase II of the project; Remodel of the Coffin-Reddington Building now complete; Phase II now proposes 25 additional units to the previously approved 201 to bring Phase II to 226 units, of which 22 would be affordable, and 233 parking spaces--bringing the unit count to 285 for Phases I and II, combined.
3 July 97	Submittal of project information by applicant;
14 July 97	Letter of support for project from neighbor to Zoning Administrator;
14 July 97	Letter of support for project from neighbor to Zoning Administrator;
18 July 97	Bay Apartment Communities letter to Planning Commission -- re: concerns of the FDR Democratic Club refuting claims made in their letter;
7 Aug 97	Initial Study Environmental Assessment--no Significant impacts noted, Negative Declaration advised;
18 Aug 97	Mitigated negative declaration certified: with mitigations for noise, wind, and construction impacts;
19 Aug 97	Building Permit application submitted (early plan check submittal prior to Planning Commission approval);
28 Aug 97	Planning Commission Meeting: revisions to Motion No. 13856, re: marketing of affordable units per City Affordable Housing Monitoring Procedures Manual;
2 Sept 97	Public Hearing Notice for Planning Commission meeting of 18 Sept 97;
9 Sept 97	Declaration of Mailing to residents with Public Hearing Notice;
9 Sept 97	Mayor's Office of Housing letter to applicant -- re: new pricing criteria for below market rate units that recently went into effect;
10 Sept 97	Planning Department memo to file -- re: changes to project;
18 Sept 97	Staff Report to Planning Commission; recommended approval of project with conditions;
18 Sept 97	Planning Commission Meeting: project approved by Motion No. 14454; conditional use permit approved for PUD;
18 Nov 97	Building Permit Issued;
Aug 98	Project in construction.

Total Time for Approvals:

Approval of First application by City:	31 Oct 1990 - 18 July 1991 = 7.5 months
First Revision Approval by City:	9 Jan 1995 - 6 April 1995 = 3 months
Current Revision Approval by City:	24 June 1997 - 18 Sept 1997 = 2.75 months
Building Permit Approval:	19 Aug 1997 - 18 Nov 1997 = 3 months
Building Construction Period:	18 Nov 1997 - Aug 1998 continuing = thus far 9.5 months

Participation / Opposition:

The current revision approval for the Bay Towers project attracted little public opposition from organized community groups, except for the FDR Democratic Club's concerns with accessibility and affordability issues. A few letters of support for the project were submitted by individuals within the vicinity of the project. No letters of opposition from local neighbors were received.

CITY of SAN FRANCISCO:
1010 S. Van Ness: affordable apartments

Project Name:	1010 S. Van Ness Avenue
Project Location:	1010 S. Van Ness Avenue southwest corner of Van Ness & 21 st Street in the Mission District of San Francisco
Developer:	Mission Housing Development Corporation 424 Valencia Street No. 280, San Francisco California 94110 415 864 6432
Owner:	1010 S. Van Ness Ltd. Partners Mission Housing Development Corporation
Project Components:	-30 residential units on .527 acres = 56.9 units per acre -3 one bdrm units @ 600 sf ea. -8 two bdrm units @ 800 sf ea. -14 three bdrm units @ 1000 sf ea. -5 four bdrm units @ 1200 sf ea. -10 units will be set aside for families with an AIDS family member -AIDS units will rent for 20-30% of income based on 20-35% AMI -all other units will rent for 30% of income based on 50-60% AMI -semi-subterranean parking garage with 30 parking spaces -laundry, common rm, landscaped courtyard -5 stories (1 level parking + 4 levels residential)
Project Numbers:	Assessor's Block and Lot No: 3615/1 and 3615/1A Case No. 95.255C and 94.440C
Project Consultants:	Architecture: Asian Neighborhood Design and the Design Studios of Gonzalo Castro V Management Company: Caritas Management Corporation

Project Description:

This affordable housing project is located at the west edge of the Mission District at 1010 S. Van Ness in a neighborhood of mixed residential and commercial uses. It is located on the corner of 21st Street and Van Ness. To the south of the site is a church; to the west are apartments; to the north and east across the streets are mixed commercial and residential. In the general vicinity of the project are 6 old Victorian houses of historical value. The project is also located at the site of a burnt out grocery store with housing above that required demolition. The 1990 fire demolished much of the property, which was never rehabilitated. Most of the site, however was occupied by a parking lot.

There are no internal streets to this project. A single vehicular entrance on the west end of 21st Street leads to a semi-subterranean parking garage that houses 30 parking spaces. This level of the building is constructed of CMU and concrete. The other 4 stories of the building are constructed of Type V wood frame on top of the concrete podium. The building is a "U" shaped courtyard building, with the open space to the west of the site. A main entry lobby from 21st Street leads directly to the courtyard and elevators and stairs to the upper floors. The south wing of the building houses the 4 bedroom units. On the ground floor, the east wing of the building is a double loaded corridor with units at the street edge and the laundry and common room along the courtyard. The ground

floor of the north wing contains the manager's office and two residential units. These ground floor units typically have two entrances each; from the courtyard side or hallway, or from the street edge. The stressed entrances all have short stairs rising from the sidewalk to covered porches below bay windows and pop-outs. The other three floors of the building are virtually identical to each other, with double loaded corridors on the east and north wings. The south wing is only 2 stories over the parking level with a deck on top at the third floor level.

The courtyard is terraced down from the building (over the parking garage) to the west where the rest of the parcel is fully landscaped. A garden pavilion in the northwest corner of the site on 21st Street opens up to this landscaped area with a long curving ramp rising to the paved terraces. Community rooms and facilities ring the terraced courtyard at the first floor level.

The building is designed eclectically in a mix of styles. The building has the feel of a contemporary Mediterranean building with a French mansard style roof with dormers attached, along with San Francisco style bay windows. Windows with bars over them at the street level open up to the parking garage. Above this level, are located the stairs, porches and entries to some of the units. Along both the street edge and the courtyard side of the building, the architects have liberally used bay windows to extend the floor plate over pedestrian areas. Some of the bay windows are also recessed between larger volumetric elements that enclose the entrance porches to the units. The short street level stairs lead up to these elements, with wrought iron security gates and fencing between them. The building is sheathed in white stucco plaster, with a metal roof supported by decorative braces at the eave level. Decorative "Juliet-balconies" jut out from the face of the building at various points. The primary decorative element at the street level are the copious wrought iron railings and fences surrounding the stairs to the units and around the west end landscaped area.

Planning and Development Issues:

While the project did not require a formal zone change, it did require a conditional use hearing by the Planning Commission to permit the PUD.

The project had to meet bulk and shadow requirements. However, a conditional use permit was sought for exceptions to various development standards, primarily the height restriction of 40 feet and rear yard setbacks.

The project site occupied two lots. The density allowances for each lot were calculated to arrive at the allowable number of units for the project. The smaller site to the south allowed 9 units, and the larger northern parcel allowed 25 units. This permitted 34 units on the site. This however was reduced to 30 units due to concerns over the size of the project. The two parcels were eventually combined later in the entitlements process.

Several cultural resources reports were prepared for this project with regard to various Victorian houses in the vicinity of the project site. These reports were prepared by an independent consultant in connection with the State Historic Preservation Office, the Mayor's Office of Housing, HUD, the SF Landmark Preservation Advisory Board and the SF Advisory Council on Historic Preservation.

The project sought funding through HOME funds provided by HUD. The agency was very involved in the planning of this project, especially with regard to environmental review. The project is a 100% affordable housing development with 10 of the units earmarked for families with one of their members having AIDS. The other units are designated for various very-low and low income level tenants. Mission Housing Development Corporation and Caritas Management will select the tenants after construction is complete.

The project received a statutory exemption from full CEQA review because of the project's affordable status. This became an issue mid-way through the entitlements process, as several residents and neighborhood groups became concerned about various potential impacts to the area's historic heritage and the effects perceived from the introduction of affordable housing into the neighborhood. An attorney was retained to represent the views of these concerned citizens, and a lawsuit was threatened. The lawsuit was dropped in favor of mediation. Mediation resolved some of the issues, resulting in the conversion of some of the larger family units to smaller apartments.

California Department of Housing and Community Development

Despite these efforts. The Planning Commission approval of the project was appealed to the San Francisco County Board of Supervisors. The Board denied the appeal and the project was approved without an EIR.

The developers voluntarily sought an Early Read on the project from the Planning Commission. This process enabled the developers to make project adjustments and major design changes prior to application.

Key Project Adjustments:

Few comments from relevant service providers and agencies were noted in the project file.

More changes were made to the project in the Early Read period than after the application was submitted. The developer was extremely flexible in the project design, and presented 3 different schemes for the city to review in the pre-application period. The city voiced its recommendation for the single building scheme which was adopted. This single building scheme however, required the consolidation of the two parcels that comprised the site. This was completed later in the entitlements process.

Some changes to the design were mandated after a Memorandum of Agreement was signed by the applicant, the city and the various historic preservation agencies. This agreement was drafted to assuage the concerns of residents, and to ensure that the design of the building harmonized with the existing historic structures. Materials, colors, heights, setbacks, scale, and landscaping were all agreed by the parties.

While no change in the unit count was noted through the course of the approvals process, changes in the number of specific unit types changed through mediation. The number of three bedroom units was decreased by 3 and the number of one bedroom units was increased by 3.

Approval Chronology: (important approval dates in bold)

9 Apr 91	Phase I Environmental Site Assessment; asbestos noted on site, but no other adverse environmental impacts;
Aug 94	Pre-application "Early Read" meetings held with staff;
Aug 94	Community Meeting held by applicant seeking neighborhood support;
3 Aug 94	Joint letter of opposition from residents of the area with 36 signatures – re: want middle income housing; too much low-income already in Mission District;
11 Aug 94	Letter of Opposition from Andrew L. Solow to Planning Commission;
17 Aug 94	applicant letter to Planning Department – re: summary of notes from project review meeting held with staff; height, setbacks and EIR exemption discussed;
31 Aug 94	Environmental Review Office letter to Andrew L. Solow – re: notification of approvals process;
8 Sept 94	Early Read request and application submitted to Planning Commission;
9 Sept 94	applicant letter to Planning Department – re: thank you for accepting Early Read for the project, and MHDC's intentions for the project expressed;
9 Sept 94	Planning Department Staff Report to Planning Commission;
9 Sept 94	Planning Commission meeting: project presented and discussed; continued to next meeting on 30 Nov 94;
13 Oct 94	Environmental and geotechnical Report by Treadwell and Rollo, Inc;
14 Oct 94	Letter of Opposition from Andrew L. Solow to HUD and Mayors Office of Housing – re: request for unit count reduction; area is too historic to allow the number of units requested in the proposal;
19 Oct 94	Letter of Opposition from the South Van Ness Neighborhood Association to the Mayor's Office of Housing – re: concerns about the Early Read decision;
1 Nov 94	Declaration of Mailing to residents filed;

California Department of Housing and Community Development

2 Nov 94 Mayor's Office of Housing letter responding to concerns of the South Van Ness Neighborhood Association – re: Early Read decision is advisory and for direction only; no formal decision or project approval to be made at this time;

4 Nov 94 Letter of Opposition from John Barkey, Vice President of San Francisco League of Neighborhoods, and President of the Liberty Hill Neighborhood Association – re: expressing concern for historic neighborhood and threat to neighborhood character;

10 Nov 94 Letter of support from Catholic Charities;

11 Nov 94 Letter from resident Andrew L. Solow requesting time change for Early Read Hearing to later in the afternoon so that he could attend;

15 Nov 94 Letter of Opposition from Andrew L. Solow – re: concerns about parking, zoning, density, and historic preservation;

16 Nov 94 Letter of Opposition from James Durfee – re: project too big and it will alter neighborhood demographic mix;

17 Nov 94 Early-Read Hearing: applicant presented 3 schemes; design guidelines for the project agreed; Planning Department liked the single building proposal;

17 Nov 94 Letter of Opposition from Jill Hohenstein – re: too much low income housing already in area;

17 Nov 94 Letter of Opposition from James B. Tyler;

21 Nov 94 Planning Department letter to applicant – re: description of fees for Early Read; \$1092 for hourly staff inputs;

22 Nov 94 Alice Estill Miller amended report on potential effects for historical architectural resources in the district;

27 Nov 94 Letter of Opposition received from Cal Watch / Neighborhood Watch Group – re: congestion in the Mission District already excessive;

30 Nov 94 Planning Commission meeting: Early Read session completed; recommendations made;

13 Dec 94 applicant letter to Planning Commission – re: thank you for the Early Read and agreement on the selected scheme; summary of comments as understood from the Early Read hearing; undated MHDC Neighborhood Density Study and project fact sheets;

Jan-Feb 95 Mediation meetings held by the Mayor's Office of Housing between residents, applicant, and Planning Department staff to resolve issues; 3 three bdrm units changed to 3 one bdrm units;

10 Feb 95 Alice Estill Miller and HUD Environmental Office letter to the State Historic Preservation Office – re: report on the historical and cultural resources in the district;

10 Feb 95 Mayor's Office of Housing letter to State Historic Preservation Office – re: seeking Memorandum of Agreement on project between the city, applicant, state, and HUD; along with concurring parties—SF Landmark Preservation Advisory Board and the SF Advisory Council on Historic Preservation;

6 Mar 95 Office of Historic Preservation letter to HUD field officer – re: clarification of district historic properties in vicinity of project site;

10 Mar 95 Architect's drawings submitted;

22 Mar 95 HUD letter to Advisory Council on Historic Preservation – re: notification of possible impacts on eligible historic properties;

7 Apr 95 Memo of Agreement between HUD, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, the State Historic Preservation Office and the Mayors Office of Housing to ensure that the proposed design is respectful to neighborhood; scale, massing, color, materials, archaeology, and landscaping agreed;

1 May 95 HUD Environmental Assessment for Mayor's Office of Housing per NEPA requirements; no Significant or adverse impacts noted; only benefits to the project area and city noted;

2 May 95 Planning Department Review of proposed design prior to application submittal;

4 May 95 Planning Department Review of proposed design prior to application submittal;

5 May 95 Notice of Public Hearing

17 May 95 Project Decision Meeting within Planning Department Staff;

18 May 95 applicant letter to the Office of Environmental Review – re: letter of support, formal request for exemption from CEQA review; summary of issues and project;

31 May 95 applicant letter to Planning Department – re: drawing submittals;

California Department of Housing and Community Development

June 95	HUD findings of no Significant impact for project and site; 13 June 95 Redevelopment Agency letter to HUD – re: environmental mitigations and conditions;
25 June 95	Attorney letter to Mayor’s Office of Housing and HUD – re: objections to HUD’s environmental findings;
26 June 95	Attorney letter to Mayor’s Office of Housing and HUD – re: requesting HUD not release funds for project;
29 June 95	Hate Mail sent to Nick Levinson and Daniel Hernandez at MHDC and other interested parties from an anonymous author; hate mail is Anti-Semitic and racist in nature with strong derogatory sexual overtones; hate mail is signed “the Good People of the Mission;” City begins hate crimes investigation;
8 June 95	Initial Study of Environmental Assessment completed; project qualifies for CEQA exemption due to affordable housing nature of project; no EIR required;
16 June 95	Planning Department letter to applicant – re: notification of no shadow impacts on adjacent buildings;
12 July 95	State Historic Preservation Office letter to the Mayor’s Office of Housing – re: project update letter and comments;
17 July 95	Conditional Use Permit application submitted; with early findings; \$24878 fee deferred for affordable housing;
17 July 95	Mayor’s Office of Housing letter to HUD – re: responses to letters of opposition;
14 Aug 95	Attorney letter to Mayor’s Office of Housing and HUD – re: objections to HUD’s environmental findings; and objection of release of HOME funds to project;
15 Aug 95	Newspaper article on the project: <i>Independent</i> ; “Neighbors Want to Shrink Housing Project;”
18-24 Aug 95	Newspaper article on the project: <i>City Voice</i> , “Lawsuit Threatens Funding for Proposed Mission Apartments;”
9 Sept 95	Letter of Opposition from John Belmeur, resident;
12 Sept 95	Mayor’s Office of Housing letter to Planning Department – re: comments on environmental assessment;
28 Sept 95	Mayor’s Office of Housing letter to Planning Department – re: comments on environmental assessment;
6 Oct 95	Declaration Restrictions: Home Investment Partnership Agreement with HUD and City;
11 Oct 95	Notice of Removal of Grant Conditions from HUD; all objections to the project have been heard and addressed; funds are released for the project;
18 Oct 95	Notice of Public Hearing for Planning Commission meeting of 9 Nov 95;
23 Oct 95	applicant facilitates a speakers training program for those wishing to speak in favor of the project at the public hearing;
25 Oct 95	Declaration of Mailing to residents filed;
Oct-Nov 95	25+ letters of support for the project received by the Planning Department from residents; Petition of Support received with 680+ signatures;
1 Nov 95	applicant letter to Zoning Administrator – re: letters of support submitted by the developer on behalf of residents of the city; 680 signatures/letters submitted;
1 Nov 95	Letter of Opposition from Andrew L. Solow – re: CEQA exemption;
3 Nov 95	Letter of Support from SPUR;
3 Nov 95	Newspaper article on the project: <i>Horizontes</i> , p. 3; discussing problems and controversies;
6 Nov 95	Letter of Support from Shanti Project;
8 Nov 95	Letter of Opposition from Anita Margrill – re: request to downsize the project;
8 Nov 95	Letter of Opposition from Andrew L. Solow – re: violation of the SF Master Plan; request to downsize the project;
8 Nov 95	Attorney letter to Planning Commission – re: Law Offices of Laurel S. Stanley representing a group of homeowners and businesses in the immediate vicinity of the project, request for denial of proposal; group wants full EIR completed; Categorical Affirmation of CEQA Exemption from the Planning Department is insufficient; they assert that the project does not meet several criteria of the exemption conditions; they are also concerned about baseline affordability of the units being too low; and impacts on their historic neighborhood;

California Department of Housing and Community Development

8 Nov 95 Attorney letter to Planning Commission – re: project design inadequate for district;
 9 Nov 95 Letter of Support for project from Mission Merchants Association;
 9 Nov 95 Health Commission comments – support for the project;
 9 Nov 95 Petition of Opposition to the project sent to the Mayor and the Planning Commission; 46 signatures;
 9 Nov 95 Andrew L. Solow letter to Planning Department – re: request for an uninterrupted block of time at the public hearing for a proposed list of speakers;
 9 Nov 95 Planning Commission meeting: project discussed & continued to next meeting of 30 Nov 95;
 15 Nov 95 Letter of Opposition from James B. Tyler;
 18 Nov 95 Attorney letter to Planning Commission – re: request for denial of project, 2nd letter;
 21 Nov 95 Memo to file – re: reaffirmation & clarification of statutory CEQA exemption from environmental review; exemption properly applied to project;
 21 Nov 95 Office of Environmental Review memo – re: project exempt from CEQA review;
 22 Nov 95 Attorney letter to City Attorney – re: possible conflict of interest between applicant and Deputy City Attorney with regard to the CEQA exemption;
 29 Nov 95 Board of Supervisors letter to Public Works – re: request for them to run a signature check on the appeal form;
30 Nov 95 Planning Commission meeting: project approved unanimously; 16 pages of findings, and 5 pages of conditions of approval; demolition of existing burnt out commercial building approved; setback variances and exceptions accepted;
 30 Nov 95 Mayor's Office of Housing memo – re: report on the developer's history and experience;
 12 Dec 95 City Attorney letter to Group Attorney – re: no ethical violations or conflicts of interest in the City Attorney's Office with regard to this project;
27 Dec 95 Appeal of project approval to SF County Board of Supervisors submitted by James B. Tyler with 54 signatures attached; appealing City Council decision on CEQA exemption to the Board of Supervisors;
 28 Dec 95 Appeal Report to City Council: staff report on the appeal of the conditional use permit authorizing the PUD for the project; full documentation of the project and issues;
 16 Jan 96 applicant letter to Board of Supervisors – re: letter of project support during appeal process;
 17 Jan 96 applicant letter to the Mayor's Office of Housing – re: thank you for support and assistance;
 22 Jan 96 Board of Supervisors meeting: appeal heard; continuation requested until after the mediation process is completed; mediation to be assisted by Supervisor Susan Leal; continued to next Board of Supervisors meeting;
 25 Jan 96 Mediator letter to parties – re: process of mediation discussions;
 7 Feb 96 Mediation meeting by the Mayor's Office of Housing between applicant and the South Van Ness Corridor Association – re: discussion of the setbacks along Van Ness and doors and garage entry placement on 21st Street;
 14 Feb 96 Mediation meeting continued: discussion and offer by applicant to incorporate the setback only contingent upon the Association's willingness to sign letter stating it will not bring legal action against the applicant, the City or HUD;
 14 Feb 96 applicant letter to Board of Supervisors – re: request for project support;
 1 Mar 96 Appeal Report to City Council: updated staff report;
18 Mar 96 Building Permit application submitted;
 25 Mar 96 Public Works Public Notice of application published – re: parcel consolidation;
 26 Mar 96 Notice of special restrictions under the code -- re: property use;
 10 Apr 96 Parcel map approved and consistent with zoning by the City Zoning Administrator;
 26 Apr 96 Architect's revisions submitted to the Building Department;
24 May 96 Building Permit issued;
 25 June 96 Planning Department letter to State Historic Preservation Office – re: review of project pursuant to the Memorandum of Agreement; project in conformance to Memorandum;
26 June 96 Notice of Decision and Order from the Board of Permit Appeals; Appeal No. 96-067; Conditional Use Permit granted; project approved;
 10 July 96 Notice of Decision and Order executed and sent to James B. Tyler who filed the appeal;

California Department of Housing and Community Development

10 July 96	Planning Department Notice of Exemption No. 50080, (OER) 95.255E filed;
21 Oct 96	Shotwell Neighborhood Association letter to Planning Department – re: request for project clarification;
28 Dec 96	Attorney letter to Planning Department – re: request for copy of Notice of Exemption;
8 Apr 98	Building Permit Finaled; project complete.

Total Time for Approvals:

Early Read by Planning Commission:	8 Sept 1994 - 30 Nov 1994 = 2.75 months
Project Approval by City:	17 July 1995 - 26 June 1996 = 11.5 months
Building Permit Approval:	18 Mar 1996 - 24 May 1996 = 2.25 months
Building Construction Period:	24 May 1996 - 8 Apr 1998 = 22.5 months

Public Participation / Opposition:

The project received Significant opposition from both individual neighbors and neighborhood groups. Throughout the entitlements process residents living in close proximity voiced discontent over the project. Most concerns dealt with the introduction of another affordable housing project into the Mission District, the density of the project, and the lack of a full CEQA review process. The project received a CEQA exemption on the basis on its affordability status. This angered many residents of old historic homes in the area who perceived a threat to both their neighborhood's livability and to their house values. Several residents wrote repeat letters to the Planning Department, the Mayor's Office of Housing, the Planning Commission, and the Board of Supervisor's. The neighborhood groups that opposed the project included the South Van Ness Neighborhood Association, The South Van Ness Corridor Association, the San Francisco League of Neighborhoods, the Liberty Hill Neighborhood Association, and the Cal Watch / Neighborhood Watch Group. These groups opposed the project for a number of reasons, including: threats to historic properties, opposed to affordable housing in the area, too much congestion in the area, and the size of the project. Several residents and neighborhood groups came together to hire an attorney to plead their Case to the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors. An appeal of the Planning Commission decision was made to the Board of Supervisors by one of the residents opposed to the project. This appeal was later rejected by the Board of Supervisors. The tenor of the opposition to this project was extremely heated and became volatile. Hate mail was received by representatives of the Mission Housing Development Corporation, and a hate crimes investigation was opened, but never solved.

In response to the heavy opposition, the developer facilitated a large base of citywide support for the project. Hundreds of signatures were collected through petition drives in support of affordable housing on the site. Many individual letters of support were submitted by residents of the area. Organizational support was offered by the Mission Merchants Association, Catholic Charities, and the Shanti Project. Several newspaper articles were also published that were sympathetic to the project. The city and Planning Department were in favor of the project all along, and sought to fast track the project—but this was not possible due to the huge wave of opposition from various corners. Of note was the attempt by the developer to educate supporters in the art of addressing the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors through a Speakers Training program. Residents in support of the project were invited to a training session to learn the intricacies of effective public speaking.

CITY of SAN JOSE:
Farmers Market: market-rate apartments

Project Name:	Farmers Market Apartments
Project Location:	335 E. Taylor Street NW corner of 7 th and Taylor Streets, San Jose at site of old Farmers Market
Developer:	Fairfield Residential, Inc. 5510 Morehouse Drive Ste. 200, San Diego California 92121
Owner:	Stella Amerian Family Trust 335 E. Taylor Street, San Jose California 95112
Project Components:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">-232 units on 6.1 acres = 38 units per acre-3 story residential / retail buildings over subterranean parking-street level retail uses along Taylor Street-total floor areas:<ul style="list-style-type: none">-residential @ 71484 sf-retail @ 4199 sf-leasing office and exercise room @ 3318 sf-7 buildings over two parking podiums: 6 residential + leasing office-158 one bdrm units and 74 two bedroom units-6 one and two bedroom unit types ranging from 535 sf - 1155 sf-North Podium buildings:<ul style="list-style-type: none">-Building 1: 45 one bdrm units & 16 two bdrm units-Building 2: 16 one bdrm units & 9 two bdrm units-Building 3: 17 one bdrm units & 11 two bdrm units-South Podium buildings:<ul style="list-style-type: none">-Building 4: 17 one bdrm units & 11 two bdrm units-Building 5: 17 one bdrm units & 10 two bdrm units-Building 6: 46 one bdrm units & 17 two bdrm units-between podiums are the leasing office, exercise rm, pool & spa-300 covered garage parking spaces + 74 open spaces + 7 leasing office spaces = 381 total parking spaces provided-maximum height @ 45'
Project Numbers:	APNs: 249-07-008 PDC 97-05-032 / PW 3-06025 / PD 97-12-098
Project Consultants:	Civil Engineering: HMM, Inc. Architecture: The Steinberg Group

Project Description:

This mixed use apartment project is located in a transitional industrial area of central San Jose within walking distance to the recently installed San Jose light rail network, and is considered by the developers and city to be a transit oriented development due to its proximity to the N. First Street light rail station. The project occupies a narrow city block with its long axis along 7th and 8th Streets. To the north of the project are Mission Street, vacant lands and a public park; to the east are 8th Street, railroad tracks, mixed-use commercial uses and another

California Department of Housing and Community Development

planned development; to the south are Taylor Street, manufacturing and commercial uses; to the west are 7th Street, warehouses, and various residential uses. The project is named for the existing Farmers Market which the development sought to replace.

The project is intended as a high-end gated community, likely renting to high tech employees of local businesses. The project consists of a partially depressed parking garage with podium courtyard development above with 232 residential units. Two parking garage entrances are located on 7th Street. The project is bi-axial in configuration with common spaces running both north-south and east-west, with the buildings in the corner quadrants. Two concrete slabs to the north and south over the parking garage would support 6 residential buildings--3 buildings on each podium--with common use facilities between them. Common uses along the center east-west axis include: a leasing office, an exercise room, a pool and spa. The mixed use nature of the project can be seen in retail uses along the Taylor street edge where a commercial arcade was to be located, which would be framed by concrete columns and a metal shed roof covering the sidewalk. The residential uses are located in three story walk-ups with double loaded corridors. On each podium the buildings frame a landscaped open space courtyard that runs north - south to create a unifying element through the project. The bulk of parking would be in the garage, however a surface parking lot for 74 cars is located along the eastern edge of the property at 8th Street adjacent to the railroad tracks that used to serve the site which cut at a diagonal across the southeast corner of the site. A smaller parking area for 7 cars with a turn around is located at the leasing office mid-block on 7th Street. The buildings are designed in a contemporary, pseudo-industrial style with standing seam metal roofs, stucco plaster walls, large vinyl divided light windows and a linear ventilation pop-up in galvanized metal along the ridge line. Detailing on the building is in galvanized metal, with decorative brackets, gates, balcony rails and gutters. Several short stairs and entrances to the podia can be seen around the project to give the development a more urban and pedestrian friendly character. The project seeks to harmonize and take advantage of the adjacent industrial feel of the neighborhood and expand the local design vocabulary.

Planning and Development Issues:

The project required a rezone from M-1 manufacturing to A(PD) very high density residential and commercial. Two rounds of project processing were necessary to approve this project: the first round included Planning Commission and City Council approval of the rezoning and the general development plan; and the second round included approval of a Planned Development Permit.

This project was controversial in many ways, as it sought to demolish the still existing Farmers Market for San Jose and a small bar and grille named Bini's that had been located there for many decades. The project required the removal of both enterprises and the demolition of their structures with compensation. The Farmers Market had been operating ad hoc, but Bini's removal met with stern opposition from local clients and the owners who approached the mayor over this issue. Bini's owners demanded a relocation site from the city, which the Mayor and Council member David Pandori addressed through the Planning and Economic Development Departments.

The property also contained a gas station, which required extensive environmental cleanup of petroleum products on site, contaminated soils, and asbestos removal. 1250 cy of contaminated soil were required to be removed at a cost of \$45,000. A cultural resources site was also located on the property, from the long since demolished Japantown from the early 20th century, in addition to two prehistoric findings within 3600' of the property. Grading was also complicated by an extremely high ground water table that required extra bracing and retaining walls for the subterranean parking garage. The project is also located in the 100 year flood plain zone, which required construction of all residences at 2' above existing grade.

Conformance with the Jackson-Taylor Residential Strategy also contributed to delays in processing this project, as the project as initially submitted rejected many of the principles of this neighborhood plan. Staff and local neighborhood groups worked with the developers to redesign the project to bring it into conformance.

California Department of Housing and Community Development

Key Project Adjustments:

In the course of the approvals process, various agencies mandated several cost additions, including: a traffic signal at 7th and Taylor Streets, road improvements to all streets surrounding the property, various fees and assessments, additional studies and site analysis, and the presence of an archaeologist during grading. The Planning Commission and Department staff required several redesigns of the project to bring it into conformance with the local neighborhood planning strategy to make it more urban-oriented and pedestrian friendly. No units were lost in the approval of the project, however.

Approval Chronology: (important approval dates in bold)

11 Dec 75	Property acquired by owner with many attempts at developing the property;
12 May 97	Preliminary Foundation Investigation and Soils Report -- requirement for retaining walls around subterranean parking garage, with other grading and fill requirements;
15 May 97	Noise Assessment Study by Edward L. Pack Assoc: mitigation required due to railroad proximity to project;
19 May 97	Planning Department Zoning and General Development Plan application submitted with fee of \$15,864;
19 May 97	Affidavit of Ownership filed;
19 May 97	Development application Checklist filled out by Planning Department;
19 May 97	application for Environmental Clearance filed with fee of \$1275;
30 May 97	Santa Clara County Roads & Airports comments – none;
2 June 97	Code Enforcement Division comments – occupancy permit required;
6 June 97	Fire Department comments – extensive comments and corrections required of applicant;
10 June 97	Police Department comments – general safety conditions appended to project;
16 June 97	Planning Department letter to applicant – re: notification of incomplete application; several studies missing, including: cultural resources, noise & vibration, soils, grading, drainage, tree survey, and a school mitigation agreement;
15 July 97	Archeological Report – requires archaeologist on site during grading for monitoring due to existing cultural resources suspected at site;
6 Aug 97	Traffic Report dated – no Significant impacts noted, no mitigation measures required; however the city has decided that a traffic signal should be installed at the intersection of 7 th and Taylor Streets;
29 Aug 97	Summary of Environmental Review from PES Environmental, Inc. (developer's consultant); no Significant environmental impacts noted;
4 Sept 97	Public Works comments – project in traffic conformance;
25 Sept 97	Bini's Attorney letter to Mayor's Office – re: request for extension of time to secure alternative location due to eviction from project site with 23 pages of petition signatures from citizens loyal to the business;
1 Oct 97	Memo from Council Member Pandori – re: the relocation of Bini's;
1 Oct 97	Neg. Dec. circulated for comment;
9 Oct 97	Follow up memo from City Manager with respect to options for the relocation of Bini's;
17 Oct 97	Environmental Clearance application submitted with Cultural Resources Evaluation, Preliminary Foundation Report, Traffic Impact Report, and Soils Report;
21 Oct 97	Morgan Wines letter of opposition to project's Neg. Dec. – request for full EIR;
22 Oct 97	Notice of Public Hearing – re: Planning Commission meeting of 19 Nov 97 and City Council meeting of 16 Dec 97 for rezoning;
24 Nov 97	Public Works comments – requiring: traffic report fee of \$775, traffic signal, improvements to Mission, Taylor, and 7 th Streets; and a park impact fee of \$1500 per unit;
26 Nov 97	Neg. Dec. Adopted and Certified at Public Hearing;
26 Nov 97	Notice of Public Hearing for protest of draft Neg. Dec. for meeting on 10 Dec 97;
26 Nov 97	Planning Department memo to Planning Commission – re: recommendation to uphold Neg. Dec;

California Department of Housing and Community Development

1 Dec 97 applicant letter to SJUSD – re: school fee mitigation agreement of \$2.06 / sf;
 4 Dec 97 Affidavit of Ownership submitted;
8 Dec 97 **Planned Development application** with fee of \$11990;
 10 Dec 97 Planning Department Staff Report – project conforms with the General Plan and Land Use / Transportation Diagram, but there are problems in the following areas: conformance with the Jackson-Taylor Residential Strategy, traffic impacts, garage entries on main facade, urban design problems and the lack of pedestrian orientation, poor interface with the neighborhood, the displacement of Bini's. Staff wants an urban design focused project that addresses the street and pedestrians rather than an internally focused project. They want individual street entrances with stoops and stairs directly to the units. Staff suggests these changes can be made at the Planned Development Permit stage;

10 Dec 97 **Planning Commission meeting and public hearing – approval of project rezoning and general development plan;** opposition to project from Morgan Wines, President of the Jackson-Taylor Neighborhood Association, who was worried about: the possible internal isolation of the project within the neighborhood and the project's internal focus, the presence of rental units in the area rather than condo's, the approval of a gated community in the neighborhood; staff concur with many of the concerns and will work with the developer to address some of these issues; Planning Commission approved project with condition of continued liaison with staff and the developer, the relocation of garage entries away from main elevation as per the Jackson-Taylor Residential Strategy Planning Area Plan adopted in Oct 1992 to maintain the pedestrian edge;

11 Dec 97 Planning Commission memo to Mayor – re: Planning Commission approval of project recommending PD Permit and rezoning;

16 Dec 97 **City Council approves the project at a public hearing:** rezoning and general development plan;

17 Dec 97 Public Works comments – update based on revised plans; minor changes to comments;
 18 Dec 97 Environmental Services Department comments – requirement for reclaimed water system on site for irrigation and landscaping;
 19 Dec 97 Fire Department comments – update;
 19 Dec 97 Urban Runoff Coordination comments – requirement of post-construction urban runoff management plan;

5 Feb 98 Meeting between neighbors, developers and staff to resolve design issues;
 6 Feb 98 Effective date of General Development Plan, which seeks to convert an older industrial area to residential uses that support adjacent downtown businesses in character with the range of existing residential housing types in the neighborhood;

13 Feb 98 Notice of Public Hearing – re: Planned Development Permit;
25 Feb 98 **Public Hearing for Planned Development Permit—permit approved;**
 3 Mar 98 Revised Architecture Drawings dated;
 19 Mar 98 Permit Acceptance Agreement and Consent signed by developer agreeing to Conditions of Approval;

20 Mar 98 **Planned Development Permit issued;** with conditions – Planning Department reserves the right to discretionary review and amendment of the project throughout the development process; all other permits, mitigations and fees are delineated therein;

27 Mar 98 Japantown Business Association letter requesting resolution of design issues;
 2 Apr 98 Planned Development Permit appealed by neighbor Mr. Josef Kelly;

Total Time for Approvals:

Rezoning and General Development Plan Approval:	19 May 1997 - 16 Dec 1997 = 7 months
Planned Development Permit Approval:	8 Dec 1997 - 20 Mar 98 = 3.5 months
Building Permit Approval:	unknown
Building Construction Period:	current

Public Participation / Opposition:

There was substantial public opposition by individuals and community groups to the project. The Jackson-Taylor Neighborhood Association opposed the design of the project, and used the Jackson-Taylor Residential Strategy Planning Area Plan to require urban design changes to the project, which the staff supported. Several individual residents also opposed the project for a variety of reasons. Bini's restaurant and bar also opposed the project because of their forced removal from their property. A petition was circulated that 100s of people signed in protest of the relocation of Bini's.

SANTA BARBARA COUNTY:
Positano: affordable apartments

Project Name:	Positano Apartments
Project location:	SW corner of Turnpike Rd and US 101 in Goleta
Developer:	Amcal Santa Barbara Fund XXXIV LP 5743 Corsa Ave No. 205, Westlake Village California 91362 818 706 0694
Owner:	SLD Properties Ltd. 3807 Sierra Highway No. 29, Acton California 93510 805 269 1696
Project Components:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">-118 total units on 5.9 acres = 20 units per acre-12 residential buildings each with various units<ul style="list-style-type: none">-bldg 1 = four unit A1's + four unit C1's + two unit E's-bldg 2 = four unit E's-bldg 3 & 9 = seven unit B's + one unit D's, ea-bldg 4 & 8 = six unit B's + two unit D's, ea-bldg 5 & 7 = four unit A-2a's+four unit C-2s+eight unit Es,ea-bldg 6 = eight unit E's + eight unit A-2a's-bldg 10 = 2 unit A-2a's + four unit E-b's-bldg 11 = four unit A-2b's + four unit E's-bldg 12 = four unit A-1's + four unit C-1's + two unit E's-unit A-1 flat: 1 bdrm / 1 ba @ 526 sf-unit A-2a / 2b flat: 1 bdrm / 1 ba @ 586 sf-unit B townhouse: 2 bdrm / 1 ba @ 843 sf-unit C-1 / -2 flat: 2 bdrm / 1 ba @ 762 sf-unit D townhouse: 3 bdrm / 2 ba @ 1054 sf-unit E / E-b flat: 3 bdrm / 2 ba @ 1020 sf-all residential buildings two stories with patio or balcony-119 covered Carport pkg spaces + 115 uncovered pkg spaces-1500 sf recreation bldg, small office bldg, laundry & utility rooms under unit D's, tot lots, picnic and BBQ areas.
Project Numbers:	APN: 65-472-007 91-DPF-002 / 92-DPF-019
Project Consultants:	Civil Engineering: Danny Wynn w/ Penfield & Smith Architecture: DesignARC Landscape Architecture: Van Atta Associates

Project Description:

This Campus-like affordable housing project is located in southern Goleta in unincorporated Santa Barbara County. To the north of the project site are the Southern Pacific Railroad Tracks and US 101; to the south are multi-family apartments and Camino de Vida; to the east is Turnpike Road; and to the west is vacant land. Vehicular access to the site is from Camino de Vida to the southeast, where a landscaped island separates inward and outward traffic to the site. The project office is located directly opposite the main entrance with visitor parking adjacent to it. An access road curves to the right of the main entrance along the eastern boundary of the property

and leads to a large communal parking area along the northern boundary. A smaller communal parking area is located to the left of the main entry along the southern boundary. This perimeter parking is divided roughly equally with Carports at the perimeter and uncovered parking adjacent to the buildings at the center. The Carports are factory finished / pre-fabricated aluminum structures shown on the plans with vegetation draping them. An 8' - 10' CMU soundwall is located along the railroad tracks and freeway at the north border.

The buildings are clustered into three groups; the west and central clusters form large landscaped courtyards. The recreation building is located within the central courtyard. The buildings each have a variety of units within them—so that various unit types are intermingled throughout the project. The units are stacked end to end to form long rectangular buildings, which serve to create the walls around the landscaped courtyards, except for buildings 1, 2 and 3 which are simply clustered together at the east. Colored concrete walkways connect all of the buildings together and to the parking areas to the north and south. Utility and laundry rooms are tucked under the D units throughout the project site. A service garage and Car wash area is located in the far northwest corner of the site. Trash and recycling areas are distributed along the perimeter of the site. In addition to the recreation building, the courtyards also provide tot lots, picnic and BBQ areas.

The buildings are designed in a spare, contemporary Mediterranean style. The roof line is broken several times in each building to break down the scale of the structures and to create a more variegated composition. The buildings also have many pop-outs and volumetric protrusions attached to them to break down their scale. The hip-roofed buildings are finished with integrated color stucco plaster for the walls, asphalt shingles for the roof, aluminum windows and sliding doors, and painted wood fascias. The windows shown on the schematic design plans are a mix of single hung and sliding windows. The balconies are enclosed with stucco half-wall barriers. Several of the upper story windows have awnings.

Planning and Development Issues:

The project did not require any rezoning. Although the approvals process was fairly straightforward on this project, it did require a full EIR due to school impacts and lack of water resources. This EIR was completed in 1992 with a later addendum for traffic and noise revisions.

The project went through two approval processes. At the time the first approval was given in 1993, a building moratorium was put in place due to water shortages in the county. When the moratorium was lifted a few years later, the project was redesigned and resubmitted as a 100% affordable project. All that was required for the redesigned project to proceed was an addendum to the previous approval and an administrative decision from the director, rather than a full Planning Commission hearing.

Since the site is gently sloping southward away from the freeway, the project required substantial grading: 13,590 cy of cut and 11,244 cy of fill.

The site was vacant prior to construction, but required the removal of several 8" diameter eucalyptus trees to accommodate the buildings.

Key Project Adjustments:

Comments from relevant service providers were standard. Several agencies required mitigation fees to allow the development, including: \$415 / unit for parks, \$301,224 for traffic impacts, and various school agreements. The EIR for the project recommended several additions to the project: tot lots to address the adverse recreational opportunities in the Goleta area and the sound wall at the northern boundary. The conditions of approval included several mandates for drought resistant landscaping, plant grouping, drip irrigation, extensive mulching, soil moisture devices, and water and energy conservation measures that were required due to Santa Barbara County's problematic drought history.

California Department of Housing and Community Development

The unit count of the project changed between the two approvals. The very first application proposed 110 units and was later withdrawn; the second proposal (for which the project was completely redesigned and for which approval was granted) requested 113 units, whereas the current project was approved for 118 units. The first approved project proposed a three story podium building with parking in a first floor garage beneath the units, along with a larger recreation complex, swimming pool and substantially larger open space, “the great lawn,” along the southern boundary. The current project eliminated this parking level and expanded recreational opportunities and dispersed the parking areas to the perimeter of the project.

Approval Chronology: (important approval dates in bold)

1991	Previous application 91-DPF-002 submitted for 110 units; project in cluster design with perimeter road; however Significant environmental impacts existed, including: school impacts, grading, solid waster, etc;
22 Apr 92	Planning Commission meeting: project not approved; major redesign requested, including: parking, circulation, and open space;
24 Aug 92	91-DPF-002 application withdrawn;
20 Sept 92	Project resubmitted with changes;
21 Oct 92	certification of accuracy and completeness of application;
5 Nov 92	Statement of intent to provide affordable housing;
20 Nov 92	application submitted with \$3906 fee for 112 units; project No. 92-DPF-019;
8 Dec 92	Fire Department comments;
17 Dec 92	Resources Mgmt Department letter to Architect – re: notification of incomplete application: issues are required acoustical reporting, phasing plans and parking layout;
25 Jan 93	Acoustical Analysis;
29 Jan 93	Santa Barbara County Flood Control and Water Conservation District comments – many conditions regarding landscaping, drainage, and water conservation measures;
4 Feb 93	Architectural drawings revised and resubmitted;
19 Feb 93	Update and addendum to Acoustical Analysis;
25 Feb 93	application completion date;
26 Feb 93	Resources Management Department letter to applicant – re: determination of application completeness;
7 June 93	Resources Management Department letter to Planning Commission – re: CEQA determination and addendum to previous EIR No. 92-EIR-1, with changes and recommended mitigations and monitoring; findings included;
7 June 93	Addendum to previous EIR No. 92-EIR-1 prepared;
15 June 93	Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District comments;
16 June 93	Santa Barbara County Parks Department comments -- \$415 fee per unit required;
undated	Notice of Public Hearing for Planning Commission meeting of 14 July 93;
6 July 93	Environmental Health Services comments and conditions;
7 July 93	Public Works Roads Division comments;
7 July 93	Public Works letter to Planning Commission – re: comments, requirement for soils report and relevant fees; conditions of approval included;
14 July 93	CEQA findings and statement of overriding consideration for 92-DPF-019;
14 July 93	Staff Report with 36 draft conditions of approval and 2 pages of findings; conditions, include requirements for the following: drought tolerant landscaping, energy conserving measures, concrete drives—no asphalt to be used, light colored water based paints, passive solar heating and cooling, natural lighting, tot lot on the site, drip irrigation, soil moisture sensing devices, extensive mulching, plants grouped by water needs;
14 July 93	Planning Commission meeting: approved project and certified 92-EIR-1 with addendum; adopted findings; granted modification to planning area setbacks; adopted Goleta Growth Mgmt Ordinance point allocation for the project; 92-DPF-019 approved subject to conditions

California Department of Housing and Community Development

of approval; changes to conditions include: no bike paths or fruit trees required on site, graffiti abatement program mandated;

15 July 93 Planning Department letter to Architect: notification of De Minimus Impact Finding;

16 July 93 De Minimus Impact Finding and Certificate of Fee Exemption from California Department of Fish & Game;

19 July 93 Notice of Determination filed with state;

19 July 93 Planning Commission letter to applicant – re: notification of project approval;

late 1993 Project did not proceed due to Water District moratorium on new development;

13 Jan 96 Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District comments;

13 Jan 96 Santa Barbara County Health Services comments;

26 Jan 96 Building Department comments: grading issues;

21 Feb 96 application submitted for amendment to 92-DPF-019-AM 01 to restart project with 118 units; request for 100% very low or low income units; request for Low Income Housing Tax Credits, CDBG & Home funds; request for open space modification reduction, decreased parking requirements; reduced setbacks for Carports within the side yard setbacks, and reduced parking design requirements. Project to be processed as affordable housing overlay site;

23 Feb 96 acoustical Analysis submitted;

27 Feb 96 Planning Department letter to applicant – re: receipt of application;

1 Mar 96 Board of Architectural Review meeting: requires tot lot on site, heavy screening of parking areas, and more variegated rooflines;

7 Mar 96 Subdivision Review Committee approved revised project;

12 Mar 96 Fire Department comments;

14 Mar 96 Public Works comments;

22 Mar 96 HCD letter offering \$500,000 of CDBG funds for project;

26 Mar 96 Addendum to EIR prepared; Significant impacts noted with regard to schools and increased student count due to the affordability aspect of the project;

26 Mar 96 Notice of Pending Action by Director: seeking public comment prior to 9 Apr 96;

26 Mar 96 Planning Department comments—CEQA determination with findings;

27 Mar 96 Santa Barbara County Flood Control and Water Conservation District comments;

15 May 96 Planning Department letter to Tax Credit allocation Committee – re: notice of project approval;

1 Apr 96 Letter of opposition from Seedorf Apartments – re: potential traffic congestion;

3 Apr 96 Letter of opposition from David and Kathleen Gress;

8 Apr 96 Letter of opposition from Don K. Louie;

9 Apr 96 Director of Planning and Development approves project by administrative action; 40 conditions of approval attached to project—similar to previous conditions—no Significant changes;

9 Apr 96 Planning Department letter to Amcal – re: Notice of Final Action by Director to amend the Development Plan;

19 Apr 96 Appeal period for project approval ends; project approval becomes effective;

5 Aug 96 applicant letter – re: request for 100% affordable units to Amcal Affordable Communities Inc;

Sept 96 Land Use Permit issued for grading of the site;

24 Sept 96 Agreement to comply with conditions of approval;

2 Oct 96 acoustical Analysis revised;

22 Nov 96 Master Zoning application form dated;

30 Dec 96 Land Use Permit for Grading and Structures;

undated Amcal letter to Planning Department – re: conformance to only some of the energy conservation measures mentioned in the conditions of approval, e.g., paint, light, appliances, landscaping, shading, direct pedestrian access, etc;

10 Jan 97 Land Use Permit issued for improvements and structures;

3 Feb 97 Planning Department letter to Engineers – re: Land Use Permit for retaining wall;

6 Feb 97 application submitted for retaining wall at project site;

24 Jan 97 Engineer letter to Planning Department – re: retaining wall design changes;

California Department of Housing and Community Development

7 Feb 97	Planning Department receives request for change to the conditions of approval – re: retaining walls;
12 Feb 97	Planning Department letter to Engineer – re: substantial conformity determination;
30 Apr 97	Planning Department letter to applicant – re: project windows;
unknown date	Building Permit application Date;
unknown date	Building Permits Issued;

Total Time for Approvals:

Initial Project Approval by City:	20 Nov 1992 - 14 July 1993 = 7.75 months
Current Project Approval by City:	21 Feb 1996 - 19 Apr 1996 = 2 months

Public Participation / Opposition:

There were a few individuals and agencies opposed to the project. Several residents of the area sent letters of opposition and the school districts had legitimate concerns over the increase in students as a result of this large affordable project.

CITY of SANTA MONICA:
Firenze: affordable apartments

<i>Project Name:</i>	Firenze Apartments
<i>Project location:</i>	1422 Sixth Street, Santa Monica California 90401
<i>Developer:</i>	JSM Firenze Partnership 429 Santa Monica Blvd No. 270, Santa Monica California 90401 310 260 1236
<i>Owner:</i>	Felicia Michel 712 Ladera Lane, Santa Barbara California 93108
<i>Project Components:</i>	-six story building / five stories above grade -28 units on 7500 sf lot (.172 acres) = 163 du / acre -one level subterranean parking / one level at grade parking -four stories of residential units -25 resident parking spaces + 6 visitor parking spaces = 31 total -26 one bedroom units & 2 studio units / all with one bath ea. -one bedroom units range from 606 sf - 678 sf -studio units are 500 sf and 505 sf -max height limit = 50' / height of project = 48' - 6"
<i>Project Numbers:</i>	APN: 429-101-90-06 Demolition Permit 95-008 Administrative Approval 95-013 Architectural Review Board 95-063
<i>Project Consultants:</i>	Architecture: REA Architects, AIA Landscape Architecture: Laura Saltzman & Associates

Project Description:

This for-profit affordable housing project is located in a mixed-use area of the central commercial district in downtown Santa Monica. The project is deed restricted to offer 24 moderate income units at rents based on 100% of median income and 4 moderate income senior units at rents based on 80% of median income. The project is constructed of one-hour fire resistant concrete and concrete block for the two level parking structure with un-rated wood construction for the four residential stories above. Subterranean parking is reached by a ramp from the Fifth Court Alley to the rear of the project. At-grade parking is accessed from Sixth Street. The project provides full security, with automatic gates at the parking levels and a secure lobby at the front entrance. Elevator and stair access to all levels is reached through the small front lobby on Sixth Street. An emergency fire stair also leads to the back alley. Individual units are accessed along open air exterior balconies from the elevator. The project is designed with a contemporary Mediterranean motif, with stucco plaster exterior finishes and built-up stucco window and cornice trims. It has a terra cotta tile mansard roof at the front elevation with a built-up flat roof over most of the project. The project is painted with two base colors (off-white and pale terra cotta) and the trim and details are painted teal. Each unit has sliding doors to either a balcony or an open patio. A small 75 sf landscaped area precedes the lobby entrance, and each unit has some type of potted landscaping or planter box at the balcony or patio.

Planning and Development Issues:

Since the project fully complied with the existing zone designation and development standards, it only required an administrative review by staff and Architectural Review Board approval; no other public hearing was required for project approval. Typically in Santa Monica, projects must obtain approval prior to design review. With this affordable project, the Architectural Review Board reviewed it prior to Administrative Review—no reason for this change in review process was noted.

A demolition permit and Rent Control Board Clearance were both required to remove an existing commercial building with 2 upper-story residential units, in addition to a single family dwelling on the site. The City of Santa Monica maintains Physical development standards for lot coverage, height, and setbacks – but has no maximum unit densities in their commercial zone, thus allowing very high residential densities.

Key Project Adjustments:

No units were lost in the approval of the project. Minor adjustments were made by the Architectural Review Board, including resubmittal of the Landscape plan featuring drought resistant plantings.

Approval Chronology:

12 Jan 95	Removal permit granted for the two units above commercial to be demolished - re: rent control;
15 Mar 95	Rent Control Board Clearance received, allowing submittal of the development application to the Planning Department;
15 Mar 95	Demolition Permit receipt with fee of \$260;
16 Mar 95	Environmental Information Form completed by applicant;
16 Mar 95	Municipal Code and General Plan Conformance Checklist completed by applicant;
16 Mar 95	Administrative Review application submitted – no fee required for application since the project is considered 100% affordable;
13 Apr 95	Planning Department letter to applicant - re: notice of incomplete application with request for title report;
17 Apr 95	Landscape drawings dated;
25 Apr 95	Architect letter to Planning Department - re: notification of changes to plans
1 May 95	Architectural Review Board application submitted;
15 May 95	Planning Department memo to Architectural Review Board - re: actions to be taken, project description, and four subjectively worded findings, e.g., “That the plan for the proposed project is expressive of good taste, good design, and in general contributes to the image of Santa Monica as a place of beauty, creativity and individuality;”
15 May 95	Color board submitted to Architectural Review Board by applicant;
15 May 95	Architectural Review Board approves the building design with requirement for resubmittal of the Landscape plan with full xeriscape plantings;
31 May 95	Deed Restriction Supplementary Information Form application - re: inclusionary housing agreement;
31 May 95	Building Permit application;
6 June 95	Landscape drawings revised;
19 June 95	Architectural Review Board approves the Landscape design;
6 Oct 95	Administrative Approval Determination prepared by Case planner;
9 Oct 95	Agreement between City and Developer imposing restrictions on real property - re: affordable housing deed restrictions;

California Department of Housing and Community Development

9 Oct 95 **Administrative Approval Determination** by zoning administrator with signature of applicant, agreeing to conditions; Minimal findings included, i.e.: conformance to the municipal code, development standards, general plan, etc; and no requirement for discretionary review as outlined in municipal code; 11 un-numbered conditions—mostly minor, process related conditions such as Architectural Review Board approval;

16 Nov 95 State Historic Preservation Officer letter to City - re: notification of no potential impacts to historic properties in the area;

14 Feb 96 **Building Permit issued;**

23 June 97 Request for Final Building Inspection;

22 July 97 **Building Permit Finaled – construction and project complete.**

Total Time for Approvals:

Project Approval by City:	16 Mar 1995 - 9 Oct 1995 = 6.75 months
Building Permit Approval:	31 May 1995 - 14 Feb 1996 = 8.5 months
Building Construction Period:	14 Feb 1996 - 22 July 1997 = 17.25 months

Public Participation / Opposition:

Although the project was posted for public comment, no public participation or opposition by individuals or community groups was noted on the project.

CITY of TUSTIN:
Rancho Santa Fe: market-rate apartments

<i>Project Name:</i>	Rancho Santa Fe Apartments
<i>Project location:</i>	2480 Irvine Boulevard at Robinson Road near Tustin Ranch Road in the Tustin Ranch Planned Community of eastern Tustin
<i>Developer:</i>	Irvine Apartment Communities / The Irvine Company 550 Newport Center Drive No. 300, Newport Beach California 92660 714 720 5564
<i>Owner:</i>	Same
<i>Project Components:</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">-316 units on 19.05 acres = 16.59 du/ac-project developed as a condominium project to be leased-26 subdivided lots: 14 numbered residential lots & 12 lettered lots-37 residential buildings, 26 Carports, 1 office / rec. building-5 different building configurations-11 unit plans<ul style="list-style-type: none">-unit type A: 2 bdrm / 2 ba @ 977 sf; 15 units-unit type B: 2 bdrm / 2 ba @ 1029 sf; 27 units-unit type B1: 2 bdrm / 2 ba @ 991 sf; 28 units-unit type C: 2 bdrm / 2 ba @ 1068 sf; 30 units-unit type D: 2 bdrm / 2 ba @ 1080 sf; 30 units-unit type E: 3 bdrm / 2 ba @ 1221 sf; 55 units-unit type F: 3 bdrm / 2 ba @ 1224 sf; 55 units-unit type G: 2 bdrm / 2 ba @ 1106 sf; 19 units-unit type H: 2 bdrm / 2 ba @ 1156 sf; 19 units-unit type J: 2 bdrm / 2 ba @ 1092 sf; 19 units-unit type K: 2 bdrm / 2 ba @ 1071 sf; 19 units-416 garage parking spaces, 216 Carport spaces, 192 uncovered parking spaces: 824 total parking spaces-community building: theater, crafts room, activities director office, video room, vending, games room, lounge, business center, file room, secretary office, manager office, 3 agents' offices, pool equipment room, kitchen, fitness center, showers, several sets of restrooms, pool, 2 spas
<i>Project Numbers:</i>	Lots 1, A, and G of tract 15055 Tentative Tract Map: TT 15350 Conditional Use Permit 96-027 Design Review: DR 96-038
<i>Project Consultants:</i>	Civil Engineering: Fuscoe Engineering Architecture: Thomas Cox Architects / Gannon Design Landscape Architecture: HRP Landesign

Project Description:

This gated apartment community is located in east Tustin within the Tustin Ranch planned community. The project site is located to the southwest of Irvine Boulevard on an old high school site. The uses surrounding the site are residential in nature, except for the Tustin Ranch Golf Club, located to the north of the project site across Irvine Boulevard.

The project has been subdivided into large parcels, each with several residential buildings. These parcels are intended to be sold to various buyers, who will in turn sell each of the units as a condominium. In the interim the units are intended to be rented as apartments until they are sold.

The project site is shaped like a crude parallelogram with curved edges. Two vehicular access points are located in the southwest corner at Irvine Boulevard (the main entry point), and in the northwest corner where a cul-de-sac has been created from an adjacent residential project. Both entries are gated. The traffic lanes of the primary project entry are divided by a planted median strip. The community building, leasing office and recreation complex is located to the north of this main entrance. The perimeter of the site is planted with trees just inside the highly articulated tube steel, masonry and tile fence that surrounds the project.

The site plan is organized around an irregular grid of streets within the skewed parallelogram. Each of the blocks within the grid contains a cluster of 4 residential buildings around a courtyard. At the perimeter of the site, triangular remnants of land are filled with Carports, uncovered parking spaces, garbage enclosures and smaller residential buildings. Each residential block or residential cluster is completely surrounded by parking or garages. Two large bays of Carports are located centrally between some of the blocks.

The residential buildings are mostly 2 story walkups with exterior stairs. The units are configured as stacked single story flats over garages. The garages all have roll-up automatic garage doors. The entrances to the units are located from inside and between the garages. The buildings are all designed in the same contemporary "Monterey" style. They are finished in stucco plaster, concrete roof tiles, sash and sliding metal windows, painted wood fascias, combination hip and gable end roofs, many volumetric pop-outs and arched openings. The buildings are heavily detailed with tile accents, wood slat balcony rails, horizontal color breaks, wood awnings, trellises, shutters, exposed rafter tails and wood trim. The buildings are painted in a variegated warm earth tone color scheme with 6 main stucco colors with off-white trim.

Planning and Development Issues:

The project site falls under the jurisdiction of the Tustin Ranch Community Plan. No rezone of the project site was required. The only official approvals that were required were a Conditional Use Permit, a Design Review Permit, and a tract map approval.

Environmental analysis for the project was covered by an Initial Study completed by the Planning Division. The project was tiered off the Tustin Ranch EIR No. 85-2 for the East Tustin Specific Plan, which was certified on 17 Mar 1986. The city prepared a Mitigated Negative Declaration for the project, as an amendment to the earlier EIR. Potential impacts are noted below.

No parkland Dedication was required for this project, as land had already been dedicated to the city through the approval of the community plan.

The city retained the right to approve and require adjustments in the materials and colors of the buildings during construction.

California Department of Housing and Community Development

Key Project Adjustments:

The conditions of approval and comments from relevant agencies added a number of environmental reports and plans, including: noise analyses, a hydrology report, a parking and vehicle storage report, a sedimentation and erosion control plan, a storm water pollution prevention plan, extensive Landscape plans, and a mitigation and monitoring plan.

This project required the payment of an exceedingly large number of fees and charges levied by various agencies. Some of these assessments are listed under the Planning Division letter to the applicant on 30 Aug 96, below.

Through the approvals process, no change in the unit count was noted.

Approval Chronology: (important approval dates in bold)

26 June 96	Preliminary Title Report;
22 July 96	Preliminary Exterior Noise Report by Mestre Greve Associates;
29 July 96	Parking / Vehicle Storage Report by Pirzadeh Associates;
30 July 96	Campaign Contribution Statement: no contributions to Planning Commission, License and Permit Board;
30 July 96	Owner's Affidavit;
1 Aug 96	Design - Zoning Review, Tract Map and Conditional Use Permit Applications submitted with fees of \$5080 paid;
1 Aug 96	application acceptance check list by Planning Division;
1 Aug 96	Environmental Information Form submitted by applicant with estimated construction schedule; construction expected to begin Nov 96 and end Nov 97;
2 Aug 96	Memo to agencies to inform of Design Review Committee meeting date;
undated	Public Works Division comments: extensive comments and requirements;
13 Aug 96	Orange County Fire Department comments: sprinklers required throughout project buildings; specific site comments and access suggestions provided;
14 Aug 96	Building Division comments: conditions of approval forwarded;
14 Aug 96	Design Review Committee meeting: project reviewed and recommended to Planning Commission; 6 pages of design review conditions attached to project approval, including: decorative hardscape treatments at project entries and cross walks, a detailed signage program, a focal point at the primary entry point, landscape screening to complement the architecture, landscape planting and earth mounding, irrigation of all landscaping, landscape plans, and spacing requirements for landscape planting;
14 Aug 96	Building Division comments;
30 Aug 96	Planning Division letter to applicant – re: notification of incomplete application with comments from all reviewing agencies; 18 pages of comments and required corrections; fees detailed, including: Building and Plan Check Fees; New Development Fees of \$450 / ea 2 bdrm unit and \$550 / ea 3 bdrm unit = \$153,000; Civic Center Expansion Fee of \$35,456; Irvine Blvd Widening Fee of \$5610; Fire Protection Facility Fee of \$36,853; Thoroughfare and Bridge Fees of \$1487 / unit = \$469,892; Assessment District 85-1 Reapportionment costs to Public Works; School fees to the Tustin Unified School District with additional independent mitigation agreement; Water and Sewer Connection Fees to Irvine Ranch Water District; and Landscape and Lighting Assessment District Fees;
5 Sept 96	Orange County Fire Department and South Coast Air Quality Management District screening form and questionnaire completed;
9 Sept 96	Engineer letter to Planning Division – re: request for deviations from city private improvement standards;
10 Sept 96	Updated Exterior Noise Analysis;
12 Sept 96	Project routed to agencies for comment;

Multi-family Projects

California Department of Housing and Community Development

12 Sept 96	Engineering / Public Works comments: proposed conditions of approval forwarded; Sedimentation and Erosion Control Plan required; CAD format required for submittal of all site plans; hydrology study required;
12 Sept 96	Exhibits submitted by applicant;
18 Sept 96	Notice of Vesting Tentative Tract Map;
18 Sept 96	Project routed to agencies for comment; due back by 17 Oct 96;
2 Oct 96	Planning Division letter to Engineer – re: responses to request for deviations;
3 Oct 96	Planning Division letter to applicant – re: 2 nd notification of incomplete application with comments from all reviewing agencies; only 3 pages of comments and corrections this time;
8 Oct 96	Public Works Division comments;
8 Oct 96	Engineering Public Works comments;
11 Oct 96	Third submittal of exhibits by applicant;
15 Oct 96	Planning Division letter to applicant – re: notification of complete application; project scheduled for Planning Commission meeting of 28 Oct 96 and City Council meeting of 18 Nov 96;
15 Oct 96	Initial Study for Environmental Assessment: Mitigated Negative Declaration recommended as amendment to existing EIR; project is to be tiered off previous EIR for community plan by Paula Ranking; no Significant impacts noted; many potential impacts noted, including: loss of agricultural land, population growth, erosion issues, changes in absorption rates, alteration of groundwater flows, impacts to air quality, increased vehicle trips, increased noise, many public service impacts, increased light and glare; extensive mitigations recommended; Mitigation and Monitoring Plan required;
15 Oct 96	Notice of Public Hearing for Planning Commission meeting;
18 Oct 96	Letter of Opposition from Jane Burgeon – re: opposed to apartment units in area; she suggests the EIR is too old and a new EIR be commissioned;
28 Oct 96	Staff Report to Planning Commission;
28 Oct 96	Planning Commission meeting: project and all permits approved; several resolutions passed unanimously; one neighbor spoke in opposition to the project; the Seville HOME OWNERS ASSOCIATION spoke in favor of the project—suggesting it was conducive to families; some project specific findings included; 18 pages of conditions supplied; conditions coded as per agency requiring condition; conditions, include: all fee and assessment requirements, formation of a Home Owners Association, cars owned by residents must be parked in garages, residents must be notified of aircraft noise from the US Marine Corps Air Station, \$2500 fee for street sweeping around the construction site, and the presence of qualified paleontologists and archaeologists on site during grading;
29 Oct 96	Precise Grading Permit application submitted;
30 Oct 96	Planning Division letter to applicant – re: notification of Planning Commission approval;
4 Nov 96	Street Improvement Plans submitted;
7 Nov 96	Agreement to Conditions of Approval signed by applicant;
8 Nov 96	Notice of Public Hearing for City Council meeting;
19 Nov 96	Planning Division letter to applicant – re: notification of City Council approvals;
12 Nov 96	Building Permit application submitted, along with letter of risk stating non-approval by the City Council at the time of submittal;
18 Nov 96	City Council meeting: amended EIR / Mitigated Negative Declaration 85-2 certified and tract map approved; no parkland Dedication is necessary for the project, since this was already covered under the larger community plan; additional mitigation measures added to the project;
19 Nov 96	Gannon Design letter to Community Development Department – re: proposed street names provided;
22 Nov 96	Notice of Determination filed; EIR amended with new mitigations;
22 Nov 96	De Minimus Impact Finding and exemption from California Department of Fish and Game fees;
16 Dec 96	Gannon Design letter to Community Development Department – re: proposed addressing of units provided;

California Department of Housing and Community Development

13 Jan 97 Gannon Design letter to Community Development Department – re: proposed street names provided again;
27 Jan 97 Community Development Department letter to applicant – re: address assignments for units;
21 Apr 97 Building Permits are issued for a portion of the project;
25 Nov 97 Building Permits are finalized and certificates of occupancy issued for a portion of the project;

Total Time for Approvals:

Project Approval by City:	1 Aug 1996 - 18 Nov 1996 = 3.5 months
Building Permit Approvals:	12 Nov 1996 - 21 Apr 1997 = 5 months
Building Construction Period:	21 Apr 1997- late Nov 1997 = 7.25 months

Public Participation / Opposition:

The project received very minor opposition from the public. Only one letter was received, and only one person spoke in opposition at the public hearings. Both of these individuals were in opposition to an apartment complex in the area—despite the property being zoned for medium density residential development through the community plan. One of the residents suggested that the community plan EIR was obsolete, and requested the completion of a new EIR.

The project received public support from the nearby Seville Home Owners Association, suggesting this type of development was conducive to bringing families into the area.